

5  
11  
R5

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward P. McAdams, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, Almighty and Heavenly Father, to send down Thy divine spirit of counsel to direct the deliberations of this august body and to keep its Members conscious of their obligations to Thee, the author and giver of all blessings. Today we are struck with fear when we see so many nations reverting to paganism and barbarous cruelties in their efforts to crush out of the minds and hearts of their citizens the spirit of liberty which we have enjoyed since the institution of our well-beloved Government. We pray Thee, therefore, to give to these lawmakers the inspiration and power to frame such laws and enactments that will conserve our liberties and bring about progress and prosperity, to the end that other nations, following after the example of the United States in its fidelity to Christian ethics, may be confirmed in peace, governed in justice, and animated with love for their fellow men. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2868. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. BORAH had been appointed members on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee on the Commemoration of the One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the First Congress of the United States, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 4, agreed to February 1, 1939.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 25. An act prohibiting the operation of motor vehicles in interstate commerce by unlicensed operators;

S. 117. An act for the relief of Lulu M. Peiper;  
S. 279. An act for the relief of Pherne Miller;  
S. 529. An act for the relief of Margaret Rose Uncapher, Milton E. Uncapher, Jr., and Andrew G. Uncapher;  
S. 584. An act for the relief of John R. Holt;  
S. 660. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the reapportionment of cotton acreage allotments not planted by farmers entitled thereto;

S. 764. An act for the relief of Charles F. Kegel;  
S. 885. An act to authorize and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credit for all outstanding disallowances and suspensions in the accounts of the disbursing officers or agents of the Government for payments made to certain employees appointed by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission;

S. 1076. An act for the relief of the widow of the late William J. Cocke; and

S. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to cause a completion of surveys, test borings, and foundation investigations to be made to determine the advisability and cost of putting in a small experimental plant for development of tidal power in the waters in and about Passamaquoddy Bay, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such examinations.

### THE GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to your attention the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority yesterday bought for \$78,600,000 from Mr. Willkie the power plants of the Commonwealth & Southern in the State of Tennessee. I want to know where you are going to get the money.

Another thing I would like to find out from the Members of this House is this: When you purchase all the public utilities of this country, where are you going to have anybody else who will be able to pay the taxes? Now we are coming to the point where you will have Government ownership of everything; where you will have this Government going into everything under this New Deal. The first thing you know we will have a Russian form of government, and we will have Mr. Roosevelt as dictator at the head of this Government. It is high time to stop putting the Government in all kinds of business. In the name of our American form of government, it is time that this New Deal government here in Washington be prohibited from buying or taking over all

private property. What will be left of our American freedom or American individualism?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

RELIEF APPROPRIATION (H. DOC. 152)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

On Saturday, February 4, I approved House Joint Resolution No. 83, which appropriates \$725,000,000 to continue the operations of the Works Progress Administration for the remaining 5 months of the current fiscal year.

I would have withheld my approval of this legislation on the ground of its inadequacy to meet human need and I would have immediately asked for a larger sum if it had not been for the provision that there shall not be a reduction of more than 5 percent of the number of employees on Works Progress projects prior to April 1, 1939.

This proviso leads to the conclusion that the Congress stands ready during the balance of February and the month of March to reconsider actual needs in time to increase before April 1 the appropriation for the last 3 months of the fiscal year.

In my message to the Congress on January 5, 1939, I recommended a supplementary appropriation of \$875,000,000. This was based on a program to give employment to 3,000,000 workers during February and March and to reduce this employment to an average of 2,700,000 workers in June. This estimated reduction of 300,000 workers by June took full cognizance of the economic recovery which might reasonably be anticipated.

Because it has been necessary during the first week of February to utilize all working capital and pay-roll reserves normally maintained to protect the funds of the United States against overobligation, it will also be necessary immediately to reestablish these reserves from the supplementary appropriation.

The net amount available to finance the Works Progress Administration from February 1 to June 30 is therefore \$725,000,000.

In discussing the employment that can be provided for 5 months with \$725,000,000 first consideration is given to the winter months of February and March. The joint resolution requires that reduction in employment in those months shall not exceed 5 percent, which reduction, if carried out, would mean the discharge of 150,000 employees.

However, I call your attention to the fact that the rolls have already been reduced by 350,000 since the last week of last October. As no new assignments have been made during this period, there has been a large accumulation of able-bodied people certified to us as in need of relief—people, however, who have not been able to secure places on the work program.

The need of these people is so apparent and so deserving that the rolls, in human decency, ought not to be reduced during February and March by even 5 percent. After conferences with the Works Progress Administration it has been determined for the above reason to hold the rolls at the present figure of 3,000,000 persons during these 2 months.

To employ these 3,000,000 people at the prevailing average monthly cost of \$61 will require an expenditure of \$366,000,000.

This will leave \$359,000,000 for the months of April, May, and June.

Under the terms of the joint resolution this sum must be apportioned over the entire period to June 30. The Administrator will have at his disposal an average of approximately \$120,000,000 per month for these 3 months—providing an average employment of slightly less than 2,000,000 persons.

Two alternatives under the joint resolution are open to the Administrator. The first is to reduce the rolls abruptly by 1,000,000 persons on the first of April and provide an average employment of 2,000,000 persons during the ensuing 3 months. This would result in throwing this very large

number of persons out of employment suddenly. Such a number cannot possibly be absorbed by private industry in time to prevent extreme distress.

And I call your attention to the fact that on the average every person discharged from the rolls has dependent on him or her three other persons. In other words the greater part of 4,000,000 Americans will be stranded.

The second alternative is to commence a week-by-week reduction on April 1 and to carry this reduction through to June 30. Even on the assumption that all reserves which under proper governmental procedure should be maintained, were completely expended by June 30, such reduction would require that employment by the end of June will be reduced to a figure well below 1,500,000 persons.

In other words the program of present employment would be slashed considerably more than one-half within a period of 3 months.

If, however, proper reserves were maintained at the end of the fiscal year, employment at the end of June would drop still further—to a figure of only slightly more than 1,000,000 persons.

Therefore, on a program of gradual reduction from 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 persons would be thrown out of Works Progress Administration employment—or, with the addition of those dependent on them, from 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 Americans would no longer receive Federal Government aid.

I ask that the Congress commence immediate consideration of these simple and alarming facts. The operations of the Works Progress Administration are of such magnitude that if a reduction such as I have above described has to be carried out, orderly and efficient planning requires that this be known definitely by the first week in March. It is equally important that the executive branch of the Government be informed at the earliest possible moment what additional funds, if any, will be available on and after April 1.

I invite the attention of the Congress to the fact that my recommendation for the larger amount was made to the Congress on January 5 and the joint resolution providing for a much-reduced appropriation was presented for my consideration more than 4 weeks later.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I report to the Congress that in my opinion an emergency now exists, and that the facts constituting such emergency are as follows:

(a) That the rolls of the Works Progress Administration should be held at the present figure of 3,000,000 through the winter months of February and March to prevent undue suffering and to care in part for those persons who have been certified as in need, but have not been given employment.

(b) That the funds which have been provided by the Congress, if not supplemented, will require a very drastic reduction in the Works Progress Administration rolls commencing April 1, 1939, which would result in removing people from the work program in numbers far beyond those that could be absorbed by industry with any conceivable degree of recovery. Widespread want or distress would inevitably follow.

(c) That the need for orderly planning of the Works Progress Administration program requires that the Administrator should know by the early part of March what funds will be at his disposal after April 1, and that, due to the time required for congressional action, this can be brought about only by my reporting to the Congress on the situation at this time.

I therefore recommend to the Congress immediate consideration of legislation providing an additional sum of \$150,000,000 for the Works Progress Administration to be available in the balance of the current fiscal year.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 7, 1939.

#### RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from committee:

FEBRUARY 6, 1939.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Because of the pressure of business in connection with the other committees of which I am a member, I hereby



submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am,  
Respectfully yours,

H. K. CLAYPOOL.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 83) and ask for its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 83

*Resolved*, That KARL M. LeCOMPTE, of Iowa, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on the Public Lands of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by having printed therein an address made over the radio last evening by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including a speech made by Dr. Parran and another by Dr. Vonderlehr, of the Public Health Service, before the Social Hygiene Association recently in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### PERMANENT PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I placed in the RECORD my feelings about the need for a permanent Public Works Administration.

I am placing in the hopper today a measure which I have introduced on my own individual responsibility, to bring about the creation of a United States Public Works Authority.

There are almost 6,000 project applications now on file with the Public Works Administration. I believe the Members of Congress and the citizenry of the United States favor a public-works program of a permanent type. [Applause.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a resolution of the American Legion of Minden, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a petition I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an address I made on Saturday night.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. HARTLEY, be granted leave of absence because of illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article regarding the continuance of P. W. A. and additional appropriations for the P. W. A. program as it might affect Erie County.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### MEXICAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State is hereby instructed to furnish the House of Representatives, within 15 days from receipt thereof, answers to the following questions:

Is it true that the Mexican Government bartered oil from American and British properties expropriated for German, Italian, and Japanese products, and is increasing such barter arrangements?

Exclusive of oil, have not American investments in Mexico been eliminated, or decreased enormously in value, since 1929, and has not this process been vastly accelerated since President Cardenas took office?

Have reported loss of American investments in many fields led to reductions in United States-Mexican trade?

Is it true that the Mexican Government has just appointed a Minister to Berlin after the post has been vacant since 1937; that Japanese Government fisheries experts have served as honorary commissioners of the Mexican Bureau of Fisheries recently and Mexican youths are being sent to Japan for free fisheries education; further, that Japanese engineers constructed the Jalapa (Mexico) Vera Cruz Highway, and that Japanese have Mexican officials' fishing concessions on the west coast?

What has the State Department done to obtain adequate compensation for American holders of bonds in the Mexican national railroads expropriated in 1937?

Does the State Department have any evidence that Germany, Italy, and Japan had an agreement to absorb Mexican oil, including that now being shipped to the German and Italian navies, before expropriation of American and British properties? Did not such shipments start almost immediately after expropriation?

Is it true that Mexican real wages have fallen in the past 2 years?

Did the Ambassador inform the State Department beforehand that the railroads and oil properties would be expropriated or was that as Mr. Josephus Daniels was publicly quoted as saying later "a bolt from the blue"?

Has the State Department a full record of the American Ambassador's speeches and public remarks in the period prior to and after the recent major expropriations and does it endorse these?

What was the complete text of all speeches made by the American Ambassador to Mexico on the subject of expropriation and also the complete text of all his reports to the Secretary of State on this subject and on the subject of Mexico's relations with Germany, Italy, and Japan, as well as reports from other sources on the same subjects?

Is it satisfied that the American Ambassador in Mexico City is now taking steps to protect the remaining American investments in Mexico on a fair basis?

Did the State Department, as publicly reported, agree to the expropriation of any American-owned property in Mexico after the recent United States-Mexican agreement to adjudicate land claims was signed, and was any such property expropriated?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the report.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ADVERSE REPORT (TO ACCOMPANY H. RES. 78)

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 78) requesting information of the State Department on Mexican relations, having considered the same, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that it do not pass:

Such information available to the Department of State as is consistent with the public interest has been furnished your committee and is on file.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the resolution be tabled.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question of consideration is not in order at this time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the report as read stated that there was a statement from the Secretary of State on file in the committee room. My question, Mr. Speaker, is whether this statement of the Secretary of State, which is not being published here and which, in my opinion, is carrying out the secret diplomacy of the administration, is open to inspection by all Members of Congress?

The SPEAKER. Answering the inquiry of the gentleman from New York, the Chair states that disposition of the report, what should be done with it, whether it should be thrown open to all Members of Congress, is a matter within the discretion of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FISH. And if the committee has taken no action, can the Members of Congress see the report?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of opinion that that is a matter that should be submitted to the chairman of the committee and the committee itself.

Mr. FISH. Can anyone outside of a Member of Congress see it? Can the reporters see it?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not without the permission of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. FISH. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a radio speech by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TAYLOR of Colorado, WOODRUM of Virginia, CANNON of Missouri, LUDLOW, THOMAS S. McMILLAN, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1940

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3743) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; and pending this motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall be confined to the bill and shall extend to 4 o'clock, the time to be equally

divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3743, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the independent offices appropriation bill carries the sum of \$1,568,506,769. As found in the report and set out in the detail analyzing the various items, the bill is \$30,000,000 plus less than the amount for comparable items in the bill last year. In the computation it is necessary to take into account some nonrecurring items. A full analytical statement of that is found in the committee report, and I will extend the statement of that in the RECORD and answer any questions a little later if it is necessary to do so.

This bill provides for something like 40 of the independent establishments of the Government. It would be physically impossible to take each one of those items and discuss it on the floor of the House, although it might be very desirable to do so. The gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Massachusetts will speak later, both of whom are thoroughly familiar with the bill, and I am going to just touch the high spots in it that I think will be of interest to the Committee and try to answer questions, if you have questions on the various items.

At the outset I want to speak of the action of the committee in withholding a portion of the salaries of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Maritime Commission. The organic law provided a basic salary of \$12,000 per annum for the Interstate Commerce Commission and for the Tariff Commission. Since the days of the economy bill in 1933 we have carried in this bill regularly a section dropping those salaries back to \$10,000 a year, notwithstanding the larger amount carried in the organic law creating these commissions. We carry in this bill for the first time the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the United States Maritime Commission. Here again Congress has fixed the basic salary of \$12,000. The committee did not feel justified in putting back the original amount for the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Tariff Commission in view of the present economic condition of the country and yet felt it would be manifestly unfair to those agencies to withhold a portion of the salaries and permit the larger amounts to be paid members of the Aeronautics Authority and the Maritime Commission; nor did the committee feel there were any such great outstanding duties imposed upon the Aeronautical Authority and the Maritime Commission that there should be any differential in the salaries paid to the membership of those two commissions.

All of those commissions are manned by distinguished, high-class citizens. Many former Members of this body are upon those commissions, but there are other agencies of the Government also. The Federal Trade Commission is one of the most important quasi-judicial commissions of the Government, on which there are two distinguished and able former Members of this body in the \$10,000 salary bracket, and while it is not a pleasing thing to withhold a portion of an official's salary, on the other hand there should be some rule, some uniformity, about the situation. The matter is brought to the House for its determination. These members ought to be put up to \$12,000 or held back to \$10,000. The action of the committee in doing so was in nowise a reflection on the distinguished gentlemen who compose these commissions. So much for that. The matter was mentioned on the floor of the House yesterday.

The Aeronautical Authority is carried in this bill, and it is one of the new agencies created by the Congress to take over the duties of the old Bureau of Air Commerce, in the Depart-



ment of Commerce, and the Bureau of Air Mail, in the Interstate Commerce Commission. This new agency has very important duties and functions to perform. We have given them \$21,218,000 with which to operate for the fiscal year 1940, and of that \$7,000,000 is for the purpose of improving airways, equipment, and safety devices upon airways, the remainder to be used for their general administrative expenses. This Authority requires a large and highly trained personnel. The committee feels that this Commission will approach its duties carefully and painstakingly, and particularly will give very careful attention to the development of high-frequency radio ranges and other very recent and important attributes of safety in aviation. The committee hopes that the Congress and this Commission will spend all of their efforts in trying to find ways and means of helping aviation and making aviation safer not only for governmental activities but for private activities as well.

The Civil Service Commission is given in this bill an increase of approximately a half million dollars. The report on page 7 shows a break-down of the duties of the Commission and the reasons for this increase in appropriation.

The Civilian Conservation Corps is carried in this bill and is given an increase of a little over \$8,000,000 over the current fiscal year, which is almost entirely accounted for by the necessity for purchasing new equipment and clothing for the enlisted personnel. This corps is maintained at the present strength of 1,500 camps, giving approximately 300,000 men average employment.

The National Labor Relations Board is carried in this bill. We give them for the fiscal year \$3,189,600 for its administrative expenses, which is \$234,600 more than it has for the current fiscal year, but \$40,000 less than the Budget estimate.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield now for a question, or would he prefer to conclude his remarks?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will yield now for a brief question.

Mr. COX. The gentleman, I am sure, knows that if there is one Member of this House whom I am willing to follow, so far as appropriations are concerned, it is the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. I am wondering just what the gentleman and his committee found in the hearings that commended the National Labor Relations Board to any special consideration on the part of the Congress. This is a judicial body, or, at least, it is supposed to be, but the injudicious manner in which the Board has carried on has brought the law into great disrepute and stands itself thoroughly discredited.

In other words, I am convinced that the Board does not function as a judicial body. The fact that it is partisan, that it acts not only as informant but as investigator, prosecutor, and judge, is well known to everybody in this country.

I am wondering if the gentleman and his committee could not have found it possible to cut down the appropriation for this activity to even a greater extent than has been done, and thereby give evidence of public dissatisfaction with the manner in which the Board has performed its functions. I believe the Board to be thoroughly disreputable and therefore deserving of no special consideration on the part of this Congress.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee in appropriating \$3,189,600 for the National Labor Relations Board or in withholding \$40,000 of the Budget estimate in no wise undertakes to pass upon the fundamental question of whether or not there should be a National Labor Relations Board or whether the Board is properly performing its duties according to what I might think its duties should be or the gentleman might think its duties should be. The committee does not feel it is the tribunal to decide whether or not there should be a repeal of the Wagner Act or amendments to it, or what should be done about it. The committee has sought to provide a sufficient fund for the National Labor Relations Board to perform the functions Congress so far has placed upon it, and that is the sole inquiry the committee has carried on.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Briefly.

Mr. COX. I have information from a source I consider worthy of belief that the National Labor Relations Board has initiated a campaign, which it is prosecuting with more or less vigor, that has for its objective the breaking down of the color line in the South. I believe in the handling of the labor problem and labor organizations that is unquestionably true. If it be true, does not the gentleman believe it might be well that there be some special investigation of the Board?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not care to express an opinion on some information that has been brought to the gentleman from some undisclosed source. I may say to the gentleman we had open hearings at which any Member of the House might have appeared if he had sought to do so, and nothing was brought to the committee in its official capacity along the line the gentleman suggests.

Mr. COX. There was no inquiry into that subject.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There was no investigation of the Labor Board. The Committee on Appropriations could not undertake to have an open, sweeping investigation of the forty-odd agencies covered by this bill. Congress has full legislative opportunity to make any change it may see fit in its wisdom to make in this law. It is not the function of the Committee on Appropriations to do it, and we have not sought to do it in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do not the hearings disclose that the members of the Board gave it as their opinion that whatever views they might have toward the sit-down strike were immaterial? Is it not also true that at page 1629 of the hearings they said the holdings of the Board were to the effect that an employer was not permitted to tell the workers they did not need to join any particular union? I know that is not a direct quotation, but is not that the substance of the testimony?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There was quite a full inquiry along that line, I may say to the gentleman, all of which relates to the matter of fundamental policy of the Board, which is not within the purview or function of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I realize the distinction, but does the gentleman believe we should continue to appropriate money for the dissemination of the doctrine that an employer cannot tell his workers whether they must join or not join a labor union?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I believe when Congress sets up an agency and in that law gives it certain functions to perform, the Committee on Appropriations should appropriate a sufficient sum for that agency to perform such functions until Congress changes the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Regardless of what the agency does?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Regardless—that is pretty broad.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know it is.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, Congress could withhold all appropriations. It is now within the province of the House, if it wishes to do so, to strike all appropriations from this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know; but in connection with this item, for instance, when the bill comes in here with a recommendation from so distinguished a gentleman as is now addressing us, the gentleman realizes there is little chance of striking it out of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman that the controversies relating to the National Labor Relations Board are not controversies the Committee on Appropriations believes it can help the House to settle. Such controversies should be considered by a legislative committee or by appropriate legislation seeking to amend the law.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the gentleman's committee take into consideration the suggestion that has been made by the President that the Wagner Act ought to be revised or amended, which might change the functions of the Labor Board?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That suggestion would not address itself to the Committee on Appropriations. The National Labor Relations Act came from the House Committee on Labor, and the Appropriations Committee would not undertake to revise that law.

Mr. DONDERO. Inasmuch as the President had made the suggestion that the law should be revised or amended, the thought occurred to me that if a revision is made the power of the Board may be curtailed, and, rather than encourage the Board in the conduct of its present procedure, the appropriation might be curtailed and the expense reduced.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Congress can do that if it wishes to do so on this bill. It can do whatever it wishes to do about the appropriation in this bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The Appropriations Committee might well take the position that under any revision of this act the law might cost more, instead of less, to administer.

Mr. DONDERO. But it might cost less also.

Mr. RAYBURN. It might cost less, but that question is not before the Appropriations Committee, as the gentleman from Virginia has so well stated. It is the duty of the Appropriations Committee to follow the will of Congress in setting up commissions and, therefore, to give such commissions enough money to function properly. Whether the National Labor Relations Board has functioned properly or whether it has pleased everybody or has pleased anybody I do not know, and that is not a question that was before the Committee on Appropriations, as the gentleman from Virginia has well said.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact that this Board has had before it since its inception 15,082 cases, and is it not also a fact that with all those cases, only in 6 percent of the cases was an order issued by the Board to cease and desist, the rest having been disposed of by agreement preceding the trial or by withdrawal on the part of the union or settled in some other amicable manner?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There are figures of that sort in the hearings, I will say to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is not that the fact?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know whether that is the fact or not. That statement was made in the record.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is the testimony in the record of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is some testimony of that sort in the record.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If that is true, this Board has certainly done a mighty good piece of work in averting strife, conflict, and contention between employers and employees and has done this at a very low cost to the Government, when only 6 percent of a total of in excess of 15,000 cases were actually tried and in which an order was ultimately issued to cease and desist.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, following up the thought of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] and the gentleman's reply thereto, it is my understanding that in every case, with the exception of one, the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the National Labor Relations Board in its findings.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I understand that is true.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me there?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman from West Virginia and the gentleman from Montana, I am asking the gentlemen if they do not know that 90 percent of the representation cases are not even made up or reported and the employees have no right of appeal?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Let me answer that statement. Those cases are settled, and whenever cases are settled they do not make headlines in the newspapers and that is the reason the public does not know about them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the employees have to take the decision.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let the gentleman point out in the Wagner law where an employee can appeal from a decision of the Board in such cases. It cannot be done.

Mr. O'CONNOR. This Board acts exactly as the Federal Trade Commission. They have the right to appeal from the National Labor Relations Board and only 6 percent of the entire 15,000 cases ever went to the court for final determination.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I challenge the gentleman from Montana, as long as he has made that statement—

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman can get that right from the Labor Board itself.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I challenge the gentleman to point out to this House any day when I am on the floor a provision in the Labor Act that gives the employee the right to appeal in a representation case.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is on the same plane as the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That provision is not in the law and the gentleman cannot point it out.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We will point it out to you; do not worry.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to get away from the National Labor Relations Board for a moment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Very briefly.

Mr. IZAC. Will the gentleman explain the difference of \$40,000 between what the National Labor Relations Board requested and the amount the committee reported?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman from California has asked the reason for the \$40,000 cut in the appropriation, and I am pleased the gentleman has called my attention to that because I was caught in this discussion and got sidetracked.

The Budget allowed 50 new positions to the National Labor Relations Board—40 in the Department and 10 in the field service. The committee allowed the field positions, but did not allow all of the departmental positions, feeling that, on the basis of the evidence we had, they could very well absorb the additional amount of routine departmental work, and out of the \$150,000 Budget increase for personal services in Washington the committee allowed \$110,000, disallowing 10 positions, which were to be highly paid positions, averaging \$4,000 a year each.

Mr. Chairman, of course, the largest item in the bill is the one providing for the Veterans' Administration and I want to take just a little time in going over this.

At the outset I want again to pay my respects, and I am confident I voice the sentiments of the committee, to General Hines and his assistants at the Veterans' Administration for the splendid budgetary control they have in that Administration. It is one of the largest Government operations, and if you will examine the hearings and follow the testimony, you will find that their budget is brought to the committee and to the Congress each year in clear and understandable fashion. Not only does the Veterans' Administration take great care in the preparation of its budgets, but other agencies might well take cognizance of one feature of their budget control, and that is the fact that they do not stop with the



mere allotment of funds, but assigned to their budget officer are a number of field representatives who, through periodical visits, make complete general administrative and efficiency surveys of the management of all field stations. This method not only provides the Administration at all times with first hand information concerning the manner in which field stations are administratively utilizing and controlling allotted funds, but at the same time assures the best possible service to the disabled veteran at a minimum expenditure consistent with good management. Further, it tends to make the operating services more alert as to their responsibilities in incurring unnecessary obligations. By doing that large savings and greater efficiency result in the Government service.

I have here a chart that I will insert at this point which tells the story.

Veterans' Administration Budget estimate for fiscal year 1940		
Appropriations:		
Salaries and expenses.....		\$97,000,000
01 Personal services.....	\$57,802,161	
0150 Fee services.....	1,467,018	
02 Supplies and materials.....	18,123,442	
05 Communication service.....	291,551	
06 Travel expenses.....	1,599,780	
07 Transportation of things (service).....	1,170,323	
10 Furnishing of heat, light, water, etc.....	2,019,075	
11 Rents.....	286,604	
12 Repairs and alterations.....	2,734,117	
13 Special and miscellaneous current expenses.....	335,628	
22 Reimbursements to States for veterans in State homes.....	770,760	
2250 Burials.....	3,894,618	
30 Equipment.....	3,050,345	
Transfers to other Government departments.....	3,620,478	
Transfers from other Government departments.....	-165,900	
Total.....	97,000,000	
Printing and binding.....		120,000
Pensions.....		432,063,000
Military and naval insurance.....		26,791,000
Adjusted service and dependent pay.....		1,104,000
Hospital and domiciliary facilities.....		4,015,000
Total.....		561,093,000

Five hundred and sixty-one million and ninety-three thousand dollars in this bill is carried for the Veterans' Administration. Of that, \$97,000,000 is for administrative expenses, and in administrative expenses we find not only the clerical work in the Veterans' Administration but nurses, attendants, orderlies, physicians, and all of the personal services that are rendered to veterans. It may be interesting to note that the Government since the beginning has appropriated for veterans of all wars about \$23,000,000,000, and about \$8,000,000,000 of that has been for the World War veterans. This appropriation of \$561,093,000 is, in reality, just a little less than the appropriation carried last year for veterans and for their services. Of this total appropriation of \$561,093,000 the veteran actually receives in cash 84.49 percent of every dollar. In addition to that he receives in personal services, hospital services, domiciliary care and out-patient treatment, and what not, 12.9 percent; and the cost of administering this fund is 2.7 percent, which, I think, is a record that should reflect credit upon the administrative forces that handle this great appropriation.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I rise to ask the gentleman some questions about the veterans' insurance. I understand there are 190,000 veterans who own governmental insurance policies, and upon those policies they pay an interest rate on their loans of 6 percent. I think it amounts to about \$9,000,000 a year. Does not the gentleman think, in view of the fact that the Government can borrow money at less than 3 percent, that it is unfair and unjust to the veterans to charge them 6 percent on those loans, because the money must go to men who are in need, destitute, and mostly unemployed.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am frank to say to the gentleman that I am not familiar with the situation in reference to that insurance, but I do know that the veterans are getting insurance on a more liberal and cheaper basis than any other American citizen can get insurance for. I know that is true.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman tell me why they are charged 6 percent when the Government borrows money at 3 percent or less?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. For the same reason that we charge the Home Owners' Loan people a greater rate of interest than the Government can borrow money for. I do not think it is a fair criterion to say that because the Government can borrow money for a certain sum it must reloan it for the same sum. The overhead charge for that service is more than the amount for which the Government can borrow money.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman understands the difference between loans to home owners and loans to veterans on insurance. Loans to home owners have to be inspected, but, so far as the loans to veterans are concerned, there is no real expense on those loans.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But the veteran has the most liberal insurance privilege of any American citizen.

Mr. FISH. Not on loans.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know about the loans.

Mr. FISH. They are paying \$9,000,000 to the Government on loans.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of this \$97,000,000, broken down, as you will see upon this chart, 2.7 percent of the total amount is administrative expense. The veterans get 84.4 cents of every dollar in cash and 12.9 cents in service.

Getting down, now, to pensions, \$432,063,000 is provided in this bill for pensions. I shall insert in the Record a chart showing the number of veterans, the total number carried on the rolls of all wars being 604,213, with 246,067 dependents, or a total of 850,280 veterans and their dependents. As shown on the chart, the amount of money involved for pensions is \$432,063,000.

Number of veterans and dependents remaining on the pension rolls as of June 30

	Fiscal year 1940			Fiscal year 1939		
	Veterans	Dependents	Total	Veterans	Dependents	Total
Yellow fever roll of honor.....		10	10		10	10
War of 1812.....		1	1		1	1
Mexican War.....		156	156		171	171
Indian wars.....	2,307	4,120	6,427	2,548	4,270	6,818
Civil War.....	2,401	52,538	54,939	3,536	59,274	62,810
Spanish-American War.....	160,415	60,638	221,053	165,074	57,459	222,533
Regular Establishment (peacetime).....	36,701	11,695	48,396	34,344	10,886	45,230
Compensation (World War, service connected).....	341,209		341,209	340,621		340,621
Pensions (World War, nonservice connected).....	59,373		59,373	52,442		52,442
Emergency officers' retirement pay (World War).....	1,807		1,807	1,819		1,819
Death compensation (World War, service connected).....		97,638	97,638		97,482	97,482
Death compensation (World War, nonservice connected).....		19,271	19,271		14,466	14,466
Total.....	604,213	246,067	850,280	600,384	244,019	844,403

#### Pensions

By projects	Fiscal year 1940	Fiscal year 1939	Fiscal year 1938
1. Yellow fever roll of honor.....	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
2. War of 1812.....	240	240	840
3. Mexican War.....	93,168	104,832	116,688
4. Indian wars.....	3,159,612	3,387,681	3,517,221
5. Civil War.....	28,856,313	33,576,764	39,233,134
6. Spanish-American War.....	123,370,520	125,062,568	118,183,019
7. Regular Establishment (peacetime).....	12,951,806	12,105,061	11,514,617

## Pensions—Continued

By projects	Fiscal year 1940	Fiscal year 1939	Fiscal year 1938
8. Compensation (World War, service connected).....	\$168,560,489	\$168,269,782	\$166,875,668
9. Pensions (World War, non-service connected).....	19,531,500	17,251,230	15,227,498
10. Emergency officers' retirement pay (World War).....	3,088,500	3,108,948	3,117,230
11. Death compensation (World War, service connected).....	53,354,052	51,893,568	42,359,416
12. Death compensation (World War, non-service connected).....	7,162,800	5,314,326	2,623,669
Total obligations.....	420,144,000	420,060,000	402,784,000
Estimated deficit fiscal year 1939 requested in 1940 estimate.....	+11,919,000	-11,919,000	.....
1939 appropriation obligated in 1938.....	.....	+1,829,000	-1,829,000
Total estimate.....	432,063,000	410,000,000	400,955,000

I shall also insert in the RECORD a chart showing the military and naval insurance, which is carried at \$26,791,000.

## Military and naval insurance

1. Disability awards.....	\$6,892,948	\$7,059,757	\$7,241,453
2. Death awards.....	10,375,248	26,667,974	67,589,992
3. Lump-sum disability awards (compromise or litigation).....	432,000	464,000	466,949
4. Lump-sum payments (payments to beneficiaries completed).....	6,727,800	3,500,265	4,561,298
5. Transfers to Government life-insurance fund.....	2,327,004	2,327,004	2,388,836
6. Refunds (premiums).....	36,000	36,000	36,152
Total obligations.....	26,791,000	40,055,000	82,284,685
Unobligated balance.....	.....	.....	6,467,315
Total estimate.....	26,791,000	40,055,000	88,752,000

That is the World War risk insurance which, as I have just stated, has given to the veteran of the World War the

greatest insurance value that any American citizen has ever received.

I shall speak briefly.

## HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

The appropriation requested under this item for 1940 has been divided into two groups, namely, major reconditioning, replacements, alterations, and construction, \$2,515,000; and construction providing additional beds, \$1,500,000.

The first group, totaling \$2,515,000, is for projects of major alterations, renovation of buildings, construction of recreational, shop, and laundry buildings, quarters, replacements of service lines, and other major projects through the accomplishment of which additional beds will not be obtained. The cost of these individual projects is over \$25,000 and requires a recommendation of the Federal Board of Hospitalization and the approval of the President, in accordance with the policy approved and established last year, affording essential coordination of Federal expenditures for these purposes and the maximum in budgetary control of appropriated funds.

The second group are projects from which additional beds will be derived and a construction program providing 483 beds during 1940 is necessary in order to care for the progressively increasing number of neuropsychiatric patients. This program covers 75 female beds at Perry Point, Md., at a cost of \$325,000, or 108—including administrative space at the same point—involving an expenditure of \$450,000; 300 beds at Roanoke, Va., at a cost of \$625,000; in addition to these three projects \$100,000 is included in the estimate for 56 additional general medical and surgical beds at the Veterans' Administration Facility at Atlanta; in all, \$4,015,000. I shall insert for your information detailed statements showing a comparison of beds available for the fiscal year 1938-39 and the estimated number available for 1940, divided as to types.

Activity	New beds in 1940	Beds available as of—			Average number of beds available in—			Percent of utilization of beds in—		
		June 30, 1940	June 30, 1939	June 30, 1938	1940	1939	1938	1940	1939	1938
Hospital beds:										
Neuropsychiatric.....	3,818	33,143	29,325	28,125	31,998	28,663	26,705	95.00	95.00	93.70
Tuberculosis.....	.....	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,171	5,255	5,255	87.00	87.00	84.90
General.....	3,172	15,567	12,395	11,700	13,928	12,083	11,426	90.00	90.00	89.60
General (homes).....	426	8,545	8,119	7,089	8,343	7,868	7,092	87.00	87.00	85.56
Total.....	7,416	62,533	55,117	52,035	59,547	53,785	50,478	92.00	92.00	90.71
Domiciliary beds.....	1,472	19,671	18,199	17,886	18,913	17,957	17,205	86.00	86.00	78.14
Grand total.....	8,888	82,204	73,316	69,921	78,460	71,742	67,683	90.00	90.00	87.52

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on the Veterans' Bureau?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. On January 1 of this year the Government had taken care of its obligation in the way of paying insurance to the beneficiaries of every one who passed away during the period of the war, from April 1917 to November 11, 1918, date of the armistice. That was a tremendous amount of money—\$57.50 a month in a majority of the cases went to the beneficiaries. Is that amount reflected by a reduction in the appropriation for the naval and military insurance in this bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is.

Mr. COCHRAN. To what extent?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Just to the extent shown on the chart before referred to. The gentleman will find a full statement in the hearings showing a reduction in that. The gross reduction is \$13,264,000. The gentleman will find it on page 39 of the report.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman. There should be a reduction yearly as we discharge our obligations.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman tell me if that whole charge of hospital care includes the care of Civilian Conservation Corps and other Government beneficiaries?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It does not, because the Veterans' Administration is reimbursed from the C. C. C. funds for whatever they do for the purpose of the C. C. C.

This chart, which is available and will be in the lobby if you are interested in looking at it, tells the whole story in another form of the amount of money appropriated under Army and Navy pensions. Of course, there is no administration in this. This is the cash money paid as Army and Navy pensions, which is compensation. I believe the veterans rather have it called "compensation" than "pensions"; but you will observe we still have a pensioner of the War of 1812, who is receiving compensation from the Government. This chart shows the number of veterans of the war, the dependents, the total number of veterans and dependents; the amount of money paid in the 3 years of 1938, 1939, and 1940 to each of that group, and presents a very interesting study, and the manner in which these funds are being used, having been appropriated by the Congress for the benefit of the veterans of the Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are others who wish to address the committee, and I do not want to consume too much time.



Unless there are some questions, I shall yield the floor. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 2 minutes. Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include certain extracts from hearings and other documents.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the latter part of the gentleman's request must be made in the House.

Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts may have permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I want at the outset to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] and to the other majority members of the committee for their consideration in connection with the preparation of this bill. Also to the able and efficient clerk of your subcommittee, Mr. Orr. I do not know how the committee would get on without him.

#### TOTALS CARRIED BY BILL

Mr. Chairman, the total carried in this independent offices appropriation bill is the largest total that has ever been carried by the bill. Taking all items into consideration it carries a total of well over \$2,300,000,000.

There is available to all a copy of the hearings on this bill. The hearings are 4 or 5 inches thick. They include over 2,000 pages. If my arithmetic is correct, if someone will paste a million dollars on each one of the pages of the hearings we shall have just about enough money available to meet the appropriations carried in the bill.

Leaving deficiency items out of the picture, the totals carried by this bill in recent years have been substantially as follows:

1935.....	\$617,000,000
1936.....	777,000,000
1937.....	880,000,000
1938.....	958,000,000
1939.....	1,596,000,000
1940, the bill under consideration.....	2,360,485,000

Last year's bill, as it went to the President, for the regular agencies carried a total of \$1,423,098,240, as compared with the total in this bill, \$1,898,512,769. Last year's bill for the emergency agencies carried an authorization of \$70,997,000 as compared with \$67,950,000 in this bill. Last year's bill carried for permanent appropriations and trust funds a total of \$101,822,740, as compared with a total of \$394,022,260 in the bill under consideration.

In other words, there is an increase in the bill before you as compared with the bill for the current fiscal year when it went to the President last year, without deficiency items, of over \$760,000,000.

About \$300,000,000 of this increase is reflected in the so-called permanent appropriations and trust funds. The balance is in part due to deficiency items and in part due to increases in items appearing in the bill.

If we eliminate \$100,000,000 advanced through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to R. E. A. a year ago, which, of course, was not included in this bill, you will find increases in the regular items carried in this bill amounting to some \$328,000,000; of \$30,000,000 in the permanent appropriations and trust funds, and a decrease of about \$1,800,000 in the authorizations for emergency agencies, a total increase in comparable items of some \$356,000,000.

Five items appearing in last year's bill do not appear in this bill: The Commodity Credit Corporation, the Electric Home and Farm Authority, the Export-Import Bank, the Pan-American Exposition, and the Federal Communications Commission. Five appearing in this year's bill did not appear in last year's bill: the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Maritime Labor Board, the Mount Rushmore National Memo-

rial Commission, the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, and the United States Maritime Commission.

Of the 37 items included in this bill, 24 show increases, 6 are on the same basis as during the current year, 7 reflect decreases.

#### AUDITING BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Last year I said something about the lack of proper auditing under the General Accounting Office.

At that time I pointed out that some 25,000,000 rental and benefit payments, aggregating \$1,282,000,000, many of them 4 years old, had not been presented for audit. I am glad to say that the necessary papers have at last been furnished and that the General Accounting Office is at work upon them.

At the same time I referred to lack of proper audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Some steps have apparently been taken in the right direction but the audit of T. V. A. for 1934 and subsequent years has not yet been completed.

Progress has been made in the number of agencies audited by the General Accounting Office. There are still, however, a number of agencies not required to account by law and others not submitting accounts as required. I insert at this point a list furnished by the General Accounting Office in this connection.

#### LIST OF ACTIVITIES WHICH ARE NOT REQUIRED BY LAW TO SUBMIT ACCOUNTS TO GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Comptroller of Currency (assessments and insolvent banks, etc.).  
Corporation of foreign security holders.  
Farm Credit Administration, activities of—  
Federal intermediate credit banks.  
Federal land banks.  
Federal home-loan banks.  
Federal Reserve banks.  
Federal Reserve Board.  
Gorgas Memorial Institute.  
Inland Waterways Corporation.  
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.  
Reconstruction Finance Mortgage Co.

#### LIST OF ACTIVITIES WHICH ARE NOT SUBMITTING ACCOUNTS TO THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AS REQUIRED

Alien Property Custodian, now Alien Property Bureau (Justice).  
Farm Credit Administration, activities of: Regional agricultural credit corporations.  
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.  
Hospital funds of various services.  
Insular government funds in United States Treasury—Philippine Islands.  
Panama Railroad Co. (including Panama Railroad Steamship Line).  
Smithsonian Institution (trust funds).  
Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Incorporated.  
Various special deposits.  
War Finance Corporation.

#### PARTIAL (ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES)

Electric Home and Farm Authority.  
Farm Credit Administration, activities of:  
Central Bank for Cooperatives.  
Production credit corporations.  
Regional banks for cooperatives.  
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.  
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.  
Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

#### PROPAGANDA

A year ago I also spoke about the development of propaganda set-ups in many of the agencies covered by this bill as well as other agencies in other appropriation bills. In the report of your subcommittee a year ago the following paragraph was included:

The committee views with disfavor the tendency to expend disproportionate sums for the printing of publications, often on high-priced paper and under expensive covers or the preparation of press releases, magazine articles, broadcasts, motion pictures, etc., the primary purpose of which is to build up a public demand for the services of the agency issuing the publicity. There has been some improvement in this respect, but the committee believes a substantial reduction of outlay in this quarter can be effected by many of the agencies without diminution of service.

That, Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt reflects the opinion of your subcommittee today. While there has been some improvement, I call attention particularly to certain agencies covered by this bill.

The Social Security Board asks for a publicity force of 91 people at a cost of \$245,540. The set-up includes the office of the Director, \$24,600; the office of the Associate Director,

\$14,700; the office of the Administrative Assistant, \$8,540; the Labor Information Division, \$33,580; the Business Information Division, \$14,300; the Press and Publications Division, \$67,040; the special service staff, \$15,440; the Field Service Division, \$67,340.

During the past year the Social Security Board's publication division, as the record indicates, published 2,083 press releases, 484 special articles, 3 pamphlets, and provided 701 hours of broadcasting at an estimated commercial equivalent of \$150,000. It seems to me the people of this country are pretty well aware that we have a social-security law and of the general terms of the law. I am frank to admit that I can see no justification for such a publicity set-up.

The Federal Housing Administration requests a publicity set-up of 76 persons at a cost of over \$212,000. This service during the past year prepared a daily clip sheet for 2,300 publications, weekly releases for 842 publications, 200 special articles, 3 motion pictures, 166 exhibits, and more than 47,000 broadcasts having a commercial equivalent of \$1,138,440. Again, I see no justification for such extensive publicity activity.

Other agencies which might be referred to in detail if time permitted are the Tennessee Valley Authority with a force of 32, at a cost of over \$107,000; and the Rural Electrification Administration with a force of 31, at a cost of over \$98,000.

It seems to me that further steps to reduce this type of activity are imperatively called for.

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

I spoke yesterday of the Federal Communications Commission, and shall say nothing further in this connection at this time.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

I want to speak briefly in reference to the Rural Electrification Administration. The testimony in respect of this activity will be found on page 705 of the committee hearings. The attention of the Committee is directed to the steady and rapid increase in the administrative expenditure of this agency. In 1936 this expenditure amounted to only \$743,000; in 1937 it was \$1,143,000; in 1938 it was \$1,520,000; in 1939 it was \$2,402,000; for 1940 the request is \$2,790,000.

Mr. Chairman, the paternalistic developments in connection with R. E. A. as emphasized in the hearings, I am frank to confess, have been amazing to me.

As the members of the Committee know, the original conception of the Rural Electrification Administration was that it should make loans for the purpose of extending electricity to those who were not fortunate enough to have had it theretofore. As things have developed, however, anticipated borrowers have not been available. As a result Uncle Sam has been organizing and nurturing borrowers. We have been setting up cooperatives for this purpose. We have been organizing them legally. We have been drawing up some 128 legal documents for them. We have been going before regulating boards in respect to franchise matters, rights-of-way matters, and so forth, in behalf of the cooperatives which we have set up. We have been going into court with respect to tax abatements and similar matters for these cooperatives. We have been helping them in the selection of their engineers for the electrical projects.

We have been helping them with specifications, with the analysis of bids, with the supervision of construction. When deposits have been made in rural banks we have been examining the banks in addition to the examination conducted by other Federal agencies. We have been giving training courses here in Washington, and when we have got the project going we have been affording guidance for boards of directors even to the point of the selection of bookkeepers.

All this work is being done, Mr. Chairman, because it is stated that it is necessary if we are going to secure repayment of the loans which are made by this activity.

I have here a copy of an application to the Tax Commission of Ohio. It is entitled: "In the matter of the Pioneer Rural Electric Corporation, Inc., taxpayer; application to obtain a reduction in the tentative assessed valuation of its property for the year 1938; memorandum submitted by the taxpayer

and by the Rural Electrification Administration on behalf of the United States of America, a creditor of the taxpayer."

I call attention to two or three statements in this application. The application recites among other things that the taxpayer is now indebted to the United States in a total of \$1,184,272. It recites further that the taxpayer has not at any time earned enough even to pay its operating expenses exclusive of debt service and essential reserves.

It recites further that the fact which is chiefly relevant to this proceeding is the earning power of the property; that in the year 1937 the gross operating revenues were \$88,111.83; that operating expenses, including taxes but exclusive of interest and reserves for depreciation and future maintenance, were \$88,084.35; that interest amounted to over \$26,000; that reserves for depreciation and maintenance at 5 percent of the book value of the fixed assets amounted to some \$50,000; that it appears, therefore, that for the first full year of operation there was a deficit of \$76,731.32, or 87 percent of the gross revenues.

It further appears that there was a similar deficit for the first 8 months of the next year amounting to almost \$50,000,000. The application recites that some deficit will continue for a period of years.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman referred to a situation in Ohio with reference to some rural-electrification project. The figures that the gentleman referred to and the big totals—do they relate in any way to the Ohio situation?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The only other totals I have given in respect to the R. E. A. were the totals showing the amount of administrative expenditures nationally over a period of years.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is what I thought. Those totals the gentleman gave last just before I interrupted were the totals that related to the R. E. A.?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The totals related to the R. E. A. administrative expenditures over a period of years with particular reference to the paternalistic work assumed by R. E. A.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there are no operating reports available, as far as I know, for the cooperatives to which we have been lending, supposedly on a self-liquidating basis. If we have got to undertake all this paternal supervision to which I have been referring, and if after all that the financial status of the cooperative to which I have referred is any fair criterion, I am wondering how many of the loans that we have made are really on a self-liquidating basis and how much of the increasing expenditure of this character we are going to get back in the long run.

I think we ought to have operating accounts for all borrowers and I think the Congress and the country ought to realize the nature of the work we are doing in connection with rural electrification.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Mr. Chairman, I have long been a believer in the general objectives sought under the social-security law, but it does seem to me that it should be possible to administer that law with an appropriation of less than \$22,000,000.

The attention of the Committee is directed in this connection to the rapid increase in administrative personnel from 6,800 in 1937, to 8,600 in 1938, to 9,000 in 1939, to 9,300 in 1940, with a total ultimately in view of 11,000.

The Committee's attention is also directed to the offices maintained in the field, 12 regional offices and 350 other offices, with an ultimate total of 1,000 offices in view.

The only activity which the Social Security Board administers fully is the old-age insurance activity. The principal work in this connection is the setting up and maintenance of the wage accounts. Forty-three million of these accounts have been set up and much of the posting is done by tabulating machinery. I find it difficult to believe a personnel here of 6,600 and a field set-up such as I have re-



ferred to should be necessary to efficient and economical administration.

The travel item of \$1,000,000 also seems to me very liberal. It is suggested that closer supervision of motor travel in the field might result in a substantial saving in this respect.

Attention is called to the testimony of Chairman Altmeyer to the effect that existing tax rates for old-age compensation purposes are sufficient without any increase in January of 1940 to pay anticipated benefits until 1949.

#### TARIFF COMMISSION

The Tariff Commission requests an appropriation of \$933,000, the same amount as was appropriated for the Commission for the current fiscal year. It seems to me it should be possible to reduce the appropriation for the Tariff Commission in view of the amount of work formerly within its field of activity now assumed by such agencies as the State Department, the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements, and the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would it be better to have the appropriation made to the Tariff Commission rather than the Department of State for reciprocal-trade agreements? Is there not a duplication of work there?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts there is, of course, one appropriation made to the Tariff Commission and an additional appropriation to the Department of State in this connection. That is one reason why it seems to me it ought to be possible to reduce the sum which we have been making available to the Tariff Commission.

For instance, under section 337 of the act which refers to unfair methods of competition, in the break-down for next year the Commission carries the sum of \$20,668; yet from the hearings it appears that there was no formal action taken under this section of the act at all during the past year. Under section 338 of the act referring to discriminations, the Commission carries the sum of \$39,335 for the next year, with little apparent work in this field during the past year. Under section 336 of the act, having to do with work under the flexible tariff provision, the Commission has allocated \$37,820 for next year; and yet it appears from the hearings that no action has been taken under this section of the act for almost 3 years, since June 1936 to be exact.

I suspect the nearest the Commission has come recently to action under this section was in reference to the request for a determination of the comparative cost of production of cemented shoes in the United States and in Czechoslovakia prior to the conclusion of the so-called reciprocal agreement with that country.

As the older Members of the House recall, the Commission was requested to make an investigation in order to obtain the difference in cost in July 1937. The investigation was made mandatory by Senate resolution in August 1937.

Not until December of that year, however, were two non-technical representatives sent by the Commission to Czechoslovakia. The agreement with Czechoslovakia was actually concluded in April 6, 1938, and I remember well, several months after the conclusion of the agreement, at my office in Massachusetts receiving a formal statement from the Commission to the effect that the investigation had been discontinued. When the representatives of that Commission came before your committee in December last, they stated that no finding had ever been made as a result of the investigation.

The chief work of the Commission seems to be in the field of reciprocal-trade agreements. Its work in that field must have been reduced as a result of the work assumed by other agencies, to which I have already referred. Moreover, the record indicates that the Commission is to receive no less than

\$28,000 by transfer from the State Department for work in this connection.

The hearings indicate that no effort is normally made by the Commission to determine the difference in the cost of production here and abroad in respect to items included in any of these trade agreements. They indicate further that in one or two instances where the Commission has made a finding of difference in cost a rate of duty has been subsequently fixed in a reciprocal-trade agreement which has actually been less than the difference in cost established by the Commission.

The older Members of the House will remember in this connection the first agreement concluded with Cuba some years ago. Just prior to the agreement the commission made a finding of difference in cost of production amounting to 1½ cents per pound. Thereupon the duty was promptly established under the trade agreement a month or two later at nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound. The result of our policy has been reflected in a loss in revenue to the Treasury of almost a hundred million dollars and the imposition on the consumers of this country, according to a recent estimate by the New York Times, of about \$250,000,000 annually, for the benefit, incidentally, of Cuba and a few large holders of Cuban sugar in this country.

Other instances appear in the hearings at page 625.

The testimony indicates that 19 trade agreements are now in effect. That two, those with Turkey and Venezuela, are pending; that one, with Cuba, is in contemplation; the agreements covering about 57 percent of our exports and 60 percent of our imports.

I am frank to state, as I have already indicated, that I believe the appropriation for the Tariff Commission might well be reduced as compared with recent years.

#### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

I want to speak briefly, Mr. Chairman, and it must be briefly, because the time for debate this morning is limited, about the item of appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority. The amount recommended for T. V. A. is \$39,000,000, plus a contract authorization of \$4,000,000, as compared with the current year in which there was an appropriation of \$40,000,000 and a similar contract authorization of \$4,000,000.

The T. V. A. project includes at present 10 principal dams, with 2 or 3 additional dams on tributary streams; substations and transmission lines; a fertilizer program; a minor item for national defense, and various items referred to as related property operations and related development activities.

Both power and fertilizer programs have been operated to date at a loss. The testimony indicates the production of 60,000 tons of fertilizer at a cost of \$11,458,193, distributed in large measure to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for use by farmers presumably to assure the production of greater crops for plowing under. It also indicates, in connection with the fertilizer program, the purchase from the International Agricultural Corporation of 570 acres of land costing the seller \$145,000 for a purchase price of \$678,459.

Under "Related property operations" and "Related development activities" appear such activities as the planting of 9,000,000 trees at a cost of \$93,000, the equipment of barges with freezing plants for strawberries costing 27 cents per pound and bringing 7½ cents when sold. Also some \$175,000 for studies and surveys obviously intimately connected with the work of Tennessee Valley Authority, including "The migration of population in the Tennessee Valley area," "Occupational administration trends in the Tennessee Valley area," "Income in the Southeast and in Tennessee," "Municipal government and administration in Tennessee," "Government and finances," and "The interterritorial freight problem of the United States."

I repeat that no audit has yet been made of Tennessee Valley Authority expenditures by the General Accounting Office for the year 1934 or any subsequent year.

Four of the ten dams have been completed, the Norris Dam, the Wheeler Dam, the Wilson Dam, and the Pickwick

Dam, which came into operation during the calendar year 1938. Three other dams are well under way, the Guntersville Dam, which comes into operation in 1940, the Chickamauga Dam, due to come into operation in 1940 or 1941, and the Hiwassee Dam, also due to come into operation in 1941. The other three dams, at Gilbertsville, Watts bar, and Coulter Shoals, are provided for to some extent in the appropriation which is before the House for consideration.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mr. MAY. Can the gentleman tell us what is the installed kilowatt capacity of the four dams that are completed and what will be included in the way of kilowatt capacity in the three dams that are already under construction?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman I find some difficulty in answering the question of kilowatt cost because of the position of the representatives of the T. V. A. before your committee. I made a little calculation based on the general allocation of 32 percent to navigation, 30 percent to flood control, and 38 percent to power, which I understand the T. V. A. gave the joint congressional committee for the 10-dam system as a whole. I tried by applying these percentages to the multiple use facilities figures to obtain a cost per kilowatt for each and every one of the 10 principal dams, and also to determine the navigation and flood-control allocations which might be fairly attributed to each. On that basis I decided that at Gilbertsville, for example, the cost per kilowatt was approximately \$277 as compared with an average for the system of \$137, as compared with a cost through steam of between \$80 and \$90, as compared with a cost at Bonneville of about \$84.

The representatives of the Commission took the position they were unable to determine a fair allocation in either respect for any single dam, that all they could do was to make a determination for the system as a whole. Therefore, I am at a loss to answer the gentleman's question in respect to kilowatt cost.

Mr. MAY. Unfortunately, I overlooked bringing my memorandum which contains the information I desire, but since I expect to address the House on this subject later in the day I will give it at that time.

Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Wilson Dam cost only \$69 per kilowatt—and it was built by the War Department engineers instead of by the T. V. A.—as against a cost of over \$200 for the Gilbertsville Dam?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky is going to develop this matter when he takes the floor. Whatever the proper method of computation may be, I feel reasonably satisfied in my own mind that power production at Gilbertsville is far less economical than by the system as a whole or by other dams in the system. I believe there is evidence to this effect in that those representing the T. V. A. indicated they were not even sure at this time that the Gilbertsville Dam would be used for power purposes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Very briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Gilbertsville Dam is largely a navigation and flood-control dam?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that in the figures furnished the joint committee there was a very definite allocation of power to Gilbertsville as well as every other dam in the system.

Mr. RANKIN. How much of the cost of the Gilbertsville Dam is allocated to power?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The representatives of the T. V. A. state they are unable to make an allocation for that purpose, but they show a kilowatt capacity for Gilbertsville as well as every other dam in the system. The capacity for Gilbertsville is shown as 128,000 kilowatts.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The gentleman speaks of navigation in connection with this dam. Of course, navigation means transportation of craft. How do the boats get over the dam?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The boats will proceed up the river by a system of locks.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Are there locks in the dams to lock the boats in?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the system is completed, the boats will move up the river through a system of locks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to my colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The hearings at page 1758 give the data submitted by the representatives of the T. V. A. In their analysis they place the cost per kilowatt at Gilbertsville at \$277, which is far in excess of the per kilowatt cost at all the other dams, in fact, so far in excess that the average cost per kilowatt at all the dams is \$137.60. If the cost at the Gilbertsville Dam is taken out of the computation, the average is reduced to \$123; therefore, the cost at Gilbertsville is so high that it raises the general average by at least \$14 per kilowatt.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am afraid the figures referred to are mine and not those of the T. V. A.

Mr. Chairman, the specific recommendation of the Budget for the T. V. A. carried in this bill includes for dams and reservoirs \$30,747,540, for transmission construction \$6,139,460, for fertilizer \$2,510,000, for national defense \$80,000, for "related property operations" \$566,000, for "related development activities" \$1,279,000, or a total of \$41,322,000, from which certain anticipated income is deducted, amounting to \$1,322,000, leaving a total of \$40,000,000. Your committee has reduced this figure by \$1,000,000, leaving a total of \$39,000,000 in addition to \$4,000,000 contract authorization.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES. Has there ever been any evidence presented that this T. V. A. will ever be a self-sustaining operation?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to my friend that the representatives from the T. V. A. would, no doubt, argue that T. V. A. will be on a self-sustaining basis eventually. The fact is, however, that to date we have been running in the red both in respect to power and fertilizer.

The amount included in the item before you, Mr. Chairman, includes the sum of \$17,203,000 for Gilbertsville, for Watts bar, for Coulter Shoals, and other tributary investigations. This may be broken down as follows: For Gilbertsville, \$12,503,000; for Watts bar, \$4,252,000; for Coulter Shoals, \$228,000; and for the tributary investigation, \$220,000.

The main problem, as I see it, in connection with this item is the extent, if any, to which the Congress will authorize expenditure for work on these dams which may be said to be new and additional construction.

Last year the House had before it the consideration of an appropriation in respect to preliminary work at Gilbertsville. On two successive occasions the House voted against that appropriation. On a third occasion it yielded to the Senate, which had voted to include the appropriation.

Personally, I do not believe the House would ever have agreed with the Senate in this respect had it not been that the final vote was taken by the House at a time when many Members opposed to the appropriation were absent from the House and in ignorance of the fact that it was to be taken up.

Mr. DONDERO. May I suggest to the gentleman right there that when the vote was taken the matter carried by just seven votes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is correct.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the total cost of this enormous dam is at present estimated by T. V. A. at \$107,000,000.



The dam itself is an enormous undertaking. It is to be 8,600 feet long and 150 feet high, creating a lake covering 58,000 acres and having a shore line of 2,000 miles.

There is a very vital difference of opinion among experts as to whether or not the dam proposed at Gilbertsville is the type of dam which should be built to accomplish the desired results. It is attacked from the navigation standpoint as being far more expensive than a system of low dams and as carrying with it extreme hazards for boats desiring to navigate the river. It is attacked from the flood-control standpoint on the basis that it is far more expensive than an alternative system of detention reservoirs and that it may be actually damaging in its effect in time of flood on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. It is attacked from the power angle on the basis that the cost of power at Gilbertsville is out of all reason as compared with power produced at other dams and in other ways, and that additional power which it might produce is in no way necessary for years to come.

As a matter of fact, the table submitted by T. V. A. shows an installed capacity, existing or under construction now, amounting to 570,000 kilowatts. As compared with this it shows that demand, both firm and secondary, will not reach 563 kilowatts until 3 years from last December.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

What I have said, Mr. Chairman, in respect of Gilbertsville applies in a general way to the other two new dams for which provision is made—the dam at Watts bar and the dam at Coulter Shoals.

Opposition to any provision for any one of these three new dams was presented to your committee by a former Member of Congress on behalf of the Mississippi Valley Association, an association apparently having 500 delegates from 25 States; also by the Ohio Valley Improvement Association; by the Mississippi System Carriers; by the National Coal Association; and by other individuals and organizations. I quote briefly from the brief filed with your committee in this connection by the National Coal Association, as follows:

The Tennessee Valley Act has now passed from the realm of theory into the realm of fact. It is too late now to undo the mischief already done. The immediate question now before the Congress and the country is simply how far Tennessee Valley Authority shall be permitted to extend and to expand its hydropower facilities and to what extent its prospective annihilation of coal markets may be checked and limited by appropriate action of the Congress.

This question is concretely present in the request of Tennessee Valley Authority for funds to finance the construction of additional hydropower dams. The purpose of this memorandum is to register the opposition of our industry and of the one-half million wage earners engaged in the industry and their families and all of the others whose support is dependent on the mining and transport of coal to the appropriation of any funds for that purpose.

In the light of the facts and for the reasons hereinbefore set forth we most respectfully and earnestly urge that in whatever appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the ensuing fiscal year, your committee may recommend and the Congress may subsequently vote, no funds be included for the Gilbertsville Dam project and for the other two dams above named, and that Tennessee Valley Authority be enjoined from expending any further moneys on these projects.

The annual loss of 5,751,000 man-days of employment in the coal industry is predicted as a result of T. V. A.'s complete electric output.

Mr. Chairman, it is of vital importance that the issue presented to Congress should be decided right. There is nothing so urgent in the picture from the point of view of power, from the point of view of flood control, from the point of view of navigation, as to justify proceeding at this time without full information as to the facts. After all, the total traffic on the Tennessee River for 1937 amounted only to 1,400,000 tons.

With the National Budget in the condition in which it is today, with the fundamental dispute between experts as to the character of dam or dams that should be constructed, with the report of the joint congressional committee of Congress yet to be received, the wise course of action for this

House and for this Congress at this time seems to me, Mr. Chairman, to defer appropriations with respect to these three new dams and to provide for a thoroughgoing, independent engineering check-up so that we may be sure that we are proceeding along correct lines. I hope the House will adopt this course of action. [Applause.]

Under leave to extend, I insert at this point certain brief comments in respect to other agencies provided for in this bill.

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY

The testimony of the Civil Aeronautics Authority appears at page 1873 of the hearings, the agency appearing in this bill for the first time. The amount recommended, \$21,218,000, reflects an increase compared with the current fiscal year of \$7,191,520. The increase may be broken down as follows:

Salaries and expenses, C. C. A.	\$4, 286, 520
Salaries and expenses, Air Service Board	380, 000
Printing and binding	100, 000
Program of air facilities	2, 425, 000

While the authority has, of course, enlarged duties to perform, the Budget allowance in respect to staff in the field would appear to have been very liberal.

#### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The testimony of the Civil Service Commission will be found on page 1090 of the hearings. The amount requested, \$86,329,000, reflects an increase of \$12,085,000 over the current year. The testimony shows, among other things, an increase in the personnel in the Federal Government since 1932 of 273,695. The figures furnished by the Commission are as follows:

Employees	1932	1938 <sup>1</sup>
Classified	467, 161	562, 909
Unclassified	111, 070	289, 017
Total	578, 231	851, 926

<sup>1</sup> June 30.

The increase from December 31, 1937, to June 30, 1938, amounted to 38,624. The total does not include the legislative, judiciary, Army, Navy, District of Columbia, or employees in the C. C. C.

#### MARITIME LABOR BOARD

The testimony of the Maritime Labor Board will be found on page 306 of the hearings. An appropriation of \$190,000 is recommended. The Board, appearing in this bill for the first time, has the duty of endeavoring to settle maritime disputes and of reporting by March 1, 1940, to the President and the Congress a comprehensive plan for the amicable adjustment of disputes between employees and employers in this field. The Board hopes to be able to bring about results comparable to those obtained by the Railway Mediation Board in the railroad field. Ultimately the question of duplication of effort between the several Federal agencies engaged in this general type of work must be considered.

#### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The testimony of the National Labor Relations Board will be found on page 1552 of the hearings. Explanation of the Board in respect to complaints as to partisanship and incompetency is included. The testimony also reflects the individual views of the members of the Board on the sit-down strike and the question of amending the Wagner Act.

#### RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The testimony of the Railroad Retirement Board appears on page 981 of the hearings. The estimated appropriation of \$123,404,000 reflects an increase of \$2,524,000 over the appropriation for the current year. Of this amount, \$615,000 is for salaries and expenses, \$450,000 for a project designed to obtain prior-service and compensation records, and \$165,000 for pending and expected claims. It is to be hoped that the increase recommended will serve to eliminate the criticism among those subject to benefits under the applicable legislation in respect to delays in adjudication of claims.

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The testimony of the Securities and Exchange Commission will be found on page 355 of the hearings. The sum recommended, \$5,370,000, reflects an increase of \$863,000 as compared with the current year, attributable largely to new duties under the National Bankruptcy Act, the Over-the-Counter Act, and the Public Utility Holding Company Act. Attention is directed to the enormous amount of paper work and the enormous duplication in connection with the paper work which is now required by the rules and regulations of the Commission. It is believed that constructive and helpful work can be accomplished through simplification and consolidation in this field with respect to the several acts defining the jurisdiction of the Commission.

## UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The testimony of the United States Maritime Commission will be found on page 839 of the hearings. The sum recommended, \$100,000,000 plus a contract authorization of \$230,000,000, compares with actual expenditure in the current fiscal year of about \$71,000,000 and a contract authorization in 1937 of \$115,000,000. The special construction program contemplated amounts to about 500 ships—50 ships a year for a period of 10 years at a total expenditure of about \$1,250,000,000. The Commission now has operating contracts with 14 companies, covering 161 vessels, and expects to cover about 230 vessels by the end of the fiscal year 1940. A start has been made in the creation of the United States Maritime Service with stations at Hoffman Island, N. Y., Fort Trumbull, Conn., and Government Island, Oakland, Calif.

## VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The testimony of the Veterans' Administration will be found on pages 631 and 1172 of the hearings. The sum recommended, \$561,093,000, reflects an apparent increase of \$13,175,500 as compared with the present year, the increase being attributable to increased administrative expenditure in connection with increased hospital and domiciliary beds and to an increase under the pension item resulting from additional legislation at the last session of Congress. An item of \$4,015,000 is included for hospital and domiciliary facilities. It is interesting to note that, with the cooperation of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled Veterans, General Hines hopes to see the employment by the end of 1940 of some 250,000 veterans.

## FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The testimony of the Federal Housing Administration will be found on page 1041 of the hearings. The amount recommended, \$12,500,000, reflects an apparent increase of \$4,000,000 over the current fiscal year, the increase resulting from increased volume of work under the 1938 amendments to the Housing Act. A deficiency item in the sum of approximately \$5,000,000 is expected to be presented in the near future with respect to the present fiscal year.

## HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

The testimony of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will be found on page 1311 of the hearings. The amount recommended, \$24,500,000, is a decrease of \$2,000,000 as compared with the present fiscal year. The Corporation has succeeded in making a very substantial reduction in the number of its field offices and it is hoped that this reduction can be further extended. The testimony indicates the acquisition by the Corporation of 118,765 properties, or about 11.7 percent of the total in respect to which loans were granted. Of the properties acquired, some 32,152, or 27 percent, have been sold at a loss of about \$19,000,000. The capital value of owned properties on hand as of November 30, 1938, is given as \$478,350,403; the current market price is given as \$370,752,461.

## PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

The testimony of the Public Works Administration will be found on page 1234 of the hearings. The amount recommended, \$20,000,000, reflects a decrease of \$4,000,000 as compared with the amount available for the current fiscal year. The program under the 1938 Work and Work Relief Act includes 6,211 non-Federal projects and 1,887 Federal projects, which must be substantially completed by July 1, 1940. About 3,500 non-Federal projects are to be completed during

the fiscal year 1940. The Administration has eliminated 45 State offices and reports that it is operating more effectively through 7 regional and 2 subregional offices.

## RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The testimony of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be found on page 1837 of the hearings. The amount requested, \$9,250,000, is the same as that made available for the current fiscal year. Increased activities in connection with business loans, mortgage loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Mortgage Co., Disaster Loan Corporation loans, and Commodity Credit Corporation loans are expected to require additional funds. The Corporation gives the following statement:

Loans and investments	\$10,202,000,000
Canceled	2,087,000,000
Disbursed	7,269,000,000
Repaid	5,314,000,000
Outstanding	1,955,000,000

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Labor Committee I have studied carefully the National Labor Relations Board. I realize that through the debate on this measure and under the 5-minute rule the administration of the act and the act itself will be attacked.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to state that I am strongly in favor of the continuation of the National Labor Relations Board.

Admittedly, a storm of controversy has arisen over the administration of the act, but for present purposes we are not concerned with that phase of the question. The pertinent question now is the choice between the survival or discontinuance of the Board. In order to eliminate any doubt which may exist in the minds of some, I wish to state briefly the broad purposes of this act.

## A SAFEGUARD OF RIGHTS

The National Labor Relations Board is an accomplished fact. It has taken its place among the agencies of government to administer what is perhaps one of the most far-reaching and progressive pieces of legislation which this Congress has ever enacted. That legislation, the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, goes no further than to safeguard the right of employees to self-organization and to select representatives of their own choosing for collective bargaining or other mutual protection without restraint or coercion by their employer.

That, in the words of the Supreme Court of the United States, is a fundamental right. Employees have as dear a right to organize and select their representatives for lawful purposes as employers have to organize their business and select their own officers and agents. Discrimination and coercion to prevent the free exercise of the right of employees to organize is a proper subject for condemnation by Congress, and that is what Congress has done in this act. That is all that the Congress is asked to do by providing funds for the continuation of this agency.

## LABOR GROUPS NEEDED

The necessity and reason for labor organizations has long been recognized. They were organized out of the necessities of the situation. A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer; he was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and his family; and if the employer refused to pay him the wages he thought fair, he was, nevertheless, unable to leave. Union alone was essential to give laborers the opportunity to deal on a plane of equality with their employer. Fully recognizing the legality of collective action on the part of employees, Congress sought to safeguard this right by making appropriate collective action of employees an instrument of industrial peace rather than of strife. And I maintain that such collective action would be a mere gesture if representation were made useless by interference with freedom of choice. Therefore, the prohibition by Congress of interference with the selection of representatives for the purpose of negotiation and conference between employers and employees, instead of being an invasion



of the constitutional right of either, was based on the recognition of the rights of both.

#### EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES GIVEN

This, in its essence, is the policy of the Congress as expressed in the National Labor Relations Act. It is a policy which does nothing more than equalize inequities which had threatened the industrial and social fabric of the Nation. It is a policy which enhances the laborer and worker at no expense or loss of prestige on the part of the manufacturer or industrialist. It is the achievement, through the medium of the National Labor Relations Board, of a nearer approach to a fuller realization of the true meaning of democratic processes as applied to the industrial problems of our country. It is interesting right here to note that only about 9 percent of the Board's cases actually go to formal hearings, and that from 90 to 95 percent of all cases handled are settled by informal discussion in the various regional offices.

I feel that no greater or timely service can be rendered to either labor or industry than that performed by voting ample funds for the continuation of this agency of democratic government. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, doubtless at least some of you know, in the past I have opposed the wide extension of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and, as a member of the House Military Affairs Committee, I think I am familiar with the activities of that particular agency of the Government. I was present at all of the hearings when the original act was written and at all of the hearings when the amendments of 1935 were added. I opposed the legislation at that time on many grounds, the principal of which was the fact that I thought it was a socialistic endeavor and that it would have a disastrous effect upon the coal industry. Of course, the question of what it may or may not do hereafter is no longer dependent upon legislative authority, because the two acts, or the original act with the amendments, are amply sufficient to justify it in doing about anything it wants to do, so that my opposition to it now rests not on those original grounds but upon the grounds that there has been waste of money and unwarranted and unjustified extravagance in its operations and that some of the proposals which it now has under consideration are extremely fantastic and unjustified. It is now engaged in numerous activities never intended by the Congress.

I shall refer briefly to the Gilbertsville Dam, which I understand they undertake to justify upon the ground of flood control and navigation. That dam will be located, if finally authorized, 22 miles from the mouth of the Tennessee River. It will be nearly 10,000 feet long and 71 feet in height. It will create a lake in the Tennessee Valley about 184.6 miles in length, and of an average width of from 3 to 5 miles, in some places as wide as 9 miles. It will submerge and cover up approximately 400,000 acres of the finest soil in the Tennessee Valley.

In addition to that it will submerge and destroy three standard-gage railroad bridges and 69 miles of standard-gage railroad. It will destroy and cover up 137 miles of hard-surface highways and 3 large highway bridges. It requires the relocation of 35,000 people and 2,500 dead bodies now sleeping in graves in that reservoir. I mention these things merely to recall the unreasonableness of this proposal. Its estimated cost originally was \$112,000,000, but now I believe that has been reduced to around \$102,000,000. It is said that it is a flood-control dam, and yet they propose to provide an installation in it for 192,000-kilowatt hours capacity for electricity. If they do that, and if this dam is available and is to be used for hydro, which it is undoubtedly intended for, it cannot be a flood-control dam, because it requires a full dam to creat hydroelectricity, and an empty dam to catch floods. So that the proposition of saying it is a flood-control dam is absurd to begin with. It not only does that but when it is located within 22 miles of the mouth of the Tennessee River and is full of water and for 184 miles up the river it undoubtedly takes up that space that would otherwise be utilized

by the flow of floodwaters from the Ohio River into the Tennessee Valley, and we have only 22 miles of space left as against over 201 miles of space, and that, of course, creates a flood situation further down the Ohio River, and particularly at Cairo. If we are going to have that dam, we are going to use those mountain peaks around it up and down that valley for 184 miles as an experiment upon which we are going to spend thousands of dollars year after year in the way of soil-erosion prevention, fertilization, and reforestation.

In other words, the proposition is to destroy good soil and put the Government into the business of trying to rehabilitate bad soil.

In addition to that, this area of over 200 miles in the lower end of the river has been surveyed, examined, and reported upon for a long number of years by the Board of Army Engineers. They have reported that with an expenditure of \$10,000,000 as against \$112,000,000, which in the end will probably be \$150,000,000, we can have a 9-foot stage from the mouth of the Tennessee River to the Pickwick Dam, and that that would be at a cost of only \$10,000,000—5 dams at \$2,000,000 each or 4 dams at \$2,500,000 each. Now, you save that amount of money.

In addition to that, you provide navigation within the channel of the stream, reserving and retaining for future use and for future generations 400,000 acres of fertile soil that now exists in that great valley along that great river.

I think it is fantastic and out of all reason. When I see many of these gentlemen from the South, from Alabama and Tennessee, here in the front seats, I am glad to invite them to the mourner's bench, and I hope that after I am through they will go out and repent for the things they have already done in this connection, and agree with an authority much higher than I that you have already got enough electricity in Tennessee. Why destroy navigation on the lower 200 miles of the river in order to get more electricity?

Now, let us take this situation: In 1933, when the hearings were held before the House Military Affairs Committee, it was proven by a strong preponderance of the testimony, and not denied by anybody, that the private utilities in that field at that time had a surplus of 50 percent over and above the normal requirements of that State and also in the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia. Since then what has happened? This Tennessee Valley Authority, under the authority of the amendments of 1935, has gone out recently and bought up the Tennessee Electric Power Co.'s facilities throughout the State of Tennessee. They have already completed four dams, as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] a few moments ago; Norris, Wheeler, Pickwick, and Wilson, the latter of which was built right after the war, with a kilowatt capacity of 484,000, in addition to that surplus of 50 percent of normal requirements that already existed.

You have seen in the papers this week where they have acquired the entire holdings of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. In that they acquired five dams in addition to the four they have completed and the three that they have under construction, with a kilowatt capacity of 138,000 kilowatts. In that purchase they have acquired three additional steam plants with a kilowatt capacity of 103,000 kilowatts, making a new acquisition in this purchase of 241,000 kilowatts.

Let me observe right here that with all of this surplus hydro and with these five dams they have recently acquired, with those now completed and under construction, they will have more than a million kilowatts capacity for that area. Yet they want to build Gilbertsville Dam for 197,000 kilowatts capacity more. A kilowatt means a horsepower. When they acquire, as they have under this purchase, the Memphis plant with 55,000 kilowatts, they will have acquired an additional 296,000 kilowatts in this entire purchase.

Now, with an unbalanced Budget, with the Congress allowing appropriations probably in excess of \$10,000,000,000 at this session, with the President with a red-hot message on the floor of this House now in the hands of Members asking an added \$150,000,000 for W. P. A., I take the position that the part of prudence, wisdom, and common sense is that we save that \$150,000,000 on the Gilbertsville Dam and these three

others that they propose to start when we come to voting on the question of striking this out of the bill and give it to the W. P. A. to be given to the poor of this country instead of giving it to somebody who wants to build up a socialistic regime in the Democratic South, if you will pardon me. I say it is the part of wisdom and statesmanship to call a halt on this program. [Applause.]

Now, I assume that the fact that the applause all came from the Republican side of the House when I made that statement means that if this Gilbertsville Dam is justified it will be in the end charged to the Democratic side of the House. I say here and now when it comes up I intend to vote against it, and I intend to go on record, and if there are enough others in this House to demand it, we will all go on record and let the country know whether we believe in economy or waste and extravagance in the face of a continuing unbalanced Budget and an ever-increasing public debt, now in excess of \$40,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman cannot blame the Republicans for applauding Democratic mistakes?

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman means to say I am making a mistake by arguing for economy I do not quite reconcile that with his position.

Mr. KNUTSON. I should have used the words "New Deal," because the gentleman from Kentucky is a Jeffersonian Democrat.

Mr. MAY. Let me go back to the subject of this Gilbertsville Lake and Dam. The lake will be 184 miles long. I want to recall that at the last session of the Congress when we defeated this thing twice and when we lost it on the third effort by only seven votes, a distinguished Member of this body, a man who is the most capable and learned man on rivers and harbors in this House, Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, made a speech on this floor.

He used as an illustration and quoted from the War Department engineers' report on the subject, the upper Mississippi improvement, and Lake Pepin which is 23 miles long with an average width of less than 2 miles, and called attention to the fact that on that short lake there were three havens for steamers of the average type which navigated the Mississippi River, and stated that on frequent occasions these steamers had sought these havens of refuge. What are you going to do with navigation on a lake with an average width of 5 miles and a length of 184 miles when the wind rises? There are no havens for even small boats with their average tow of barges. It simply means that when you shall have authorized ultimately the Gilbertsville Dam, and when you shall have appropriated more money for it, that you open the door for a further extension; and then David Lilienthal and his group will build havens every 5 miles on both sides of the lake for the next 100 years.

Let me call attention to another fact: In addition to obligating themselves to pay out \$80,000,000 for the Tennessee Electric Power Co.'s facilities in the State of Tennessee, they are authorized under a section of the original act to issue \$100,000,000 of 3-percent bonds guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the Federal Government; and we were told in our committee by Arthur Morgan, the Chairman of that Authority, that they were keeping that as a backlog. This means they are going to milk the cow as long as she will give any milk, but when she commences to kick they are going to sit down in Washington and issue \$100,000,000 in bonds and tell the Congress to go to Hades.

They are milking the Appropriations Committee of the House now and as long as we will permit it they will continue the milking and spending program and along with it bleed the taxpayers white. It will not be long now until they will shut down the steam plants they bought from Tennessee Electric and throw more coal mines out of work. Going back to Representative JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, the distinguished chairman of the Flood Control Committee of this House, he said in debate last Congress:

I called attention to the fact that the lake to be formed by this dam would be 184 miles long, 7 miles wide at the widest place, and

deep enough to accommodate the largest ocean ship. I took the view that such a large lake would be too hazardous in rough weather for the safe operation of the low, flat, steel barges now operated on the Ohio and Mississippi, which are only a few feet above the water line when loaded. My thought was that this dam would break the chain of continuous navigation between the Tennessee and the Ohio-Mississippi system and require a different type of boat and necessitate the transfer of cargoes. Some have expressed the view that I was mistaken.

In this connection I called attention to Lake Pepin, on the upper Mississippi, where disasters have occurred resulting in the loss of both life and property. On pages 1 and 2 of Document 151, Seventy-second Congress, Lake Pepin is described by General Brown, then Chief of Engineers, as follows:

"Lake Pepin is an enlargement of the Mississippi River, 23 miles in length and from 1 to 2½ miles in width. The depths in the lake range from 25 to 35 feet."

From this description it will be seen that Lake Pepin is quite small as compared with the Gilbertsville Lake, as proposed by the T. V. A. Yet Congress has found it necessary to construct as many as three harbors for refuge on this lake for the protection of traffic.

These harbors of refuge were constructed before the adoption of the 9-foot project on the upper Mississippi, and they are now being reconstructed at considerable cost, to meet the new water level conditions, as well as to be better adjusted to the type of barge now in operation.

I will give a few brief extracts from Document 151 with reference to conditions on Lake Pepin. On page 2, General Brown, Chief of Engineers, said:

"Suitable harbors on the lake in which tows may take refuge in storm are essential."

On pages 3 and 4, General Deakayne said:

"When storms occur or threaten during periods of high water, vessels are obliged to stand by either at the head or foot of Lake Pepin, due to the lack of a safe harbor."

Further, on page 4, General Deakayne said:

"It appears that a harbor of refuge at Lake City is of material advantage to through traffic."

On page 5, Colonel Willing, the district engineer, in reference to Lake Pepin, said:

"A report on the preliminary examination of the locality was submitted November 9, 1927, and included a geographical and physical description, reference to previous reports and the river conditions which make it desirable that a safe harbor of refuge be provided."

On pages 5 and 6, Colonel Willing further said:

"One of the most serious results to through navigation at present is the lack of a safe harbor during high-water periods. It is a contributing factor in causing vessels to stand by at either the head or foot of Lake Pepin during and when storms are developing."

On page 8, Colonel Spalding, the division engineer, said:

"The United States has constructed three harbors of refuge in Lake Pepin, one at Lake City, Minn.; one at Stockholm, Wis.; and one at Pepin, Wis. The two latter harbors are located across the lake from Lake City, 1 mile above and 6 miles below, respectively."

On pages 8 and 9, Colonel Spalding made further references to the unsafe conditions for navigation on Lake Pepin. These conditions, so hazardous to modern barge traffic, are in no sense of the word to be considered as limited to that type of navigation facilities. The waves in rough weather were a source of danger to the comparatively high-decked packet vessels of the "steamboat days." Even in 1882 Congress authorized a harbor of refuge there, to be formed by the construction of a pier 871 feet long. In 1887 one of the greatest river disasters in our history occurred on Lake Pepin when the oceanlike waves overwhelmed the decks of the steamboat *Sea Wing*, resulting in the destruction of the vessel and the loss of nearly 100 human lives.

Lake Pepin has furnished us a laboratory test. Such a test, as all engineers will agree, has greater weight than the opinion of an expert upon a hypothesis.

The T. V. A. brief gives extracts from the testimony of General Pillsbury and Colonel Watkins, showing the points of vantage of high-dam navigation over low-dam navigation. I take no issue with that testimony. It is true that there are many points in favor of high dams and large lakes. You have fewer stops for locking, you have a less number of locks to operate and maintain, you can to a certain extent avoid meanders in the natural course of the streams.

From these points of view, without taking other matters into consideration, then the larger the lake the better the navigation. From that viewpoint a lake as large as the Gulf of Mexico would afford an almost perfect example. Yet no sane person would attempt to cross such a lake with a six- or eight-barge fleet of coal, such as is in operation on the Ohio.

The T. V. A. brief praises Colonel Watkins, who was a witness at the Chattanooga hearing. It says he is more familiar than is any other person with the Tennessee, and denominates his report as embraced in Document 328, Seventy-first Congress, as the bible of the T. V. A. Yet, in all the years Colonel Watkins was engaged in his work upon the Tennessee, he failed to discover Gilbertsville, or to recommend any dam there, of any type, high or low. His recommendation on pages 100 and 101 of Document 328, after thorough consideration of every phase of the case, is as follows:

"It is recommended that a project for the progressive improvement of the Tennessee River from its mouth to Knoxville by a system of movable or low fixed dams and by locks of Ohio River standards be adopted to be completed within a period of 10 years



at an estimated cost of \$75,000,000, at the rate of \$3,000,000 for the first year and \$8,000,000 for each year thereafter until completion, with \$40,000 for annual operation, care, and maintenance for each dam and pool; with the proviso that under the provision of the Federal Water Power Act there may be substituted for any two or more of the low dams herein provided for a high dam if the resulting cost to the Federal Government will be less than by the estimate herein for the low dams thus rendered unnecessary, and provided further that the capacity of the waterway for the economical movement of modern barge traffic will not be in any way lessened."

It will be seen that Colonel Watkins recommended the low dams for the Tennessee, with the proviso that a high dam might be substituted for any two or more of the low dams, but on condition that the cost to the Federal Government would be less than by the low dams, and with the further significant proviso "that the capacity of the waterway for the economical movement of modern barge traffic will not be in any way lessened."

It is very evident that Colonel Watkins anticipated that private interests might want to construct high dams for power purposes, and he wanted to safeguard the public interest. Under his recommendation, which was also the recommendation of the Board and of the Chief of Engineers, no locks or dams would be permitted if they were of such character as to interfere with or menace navigation.

The Gilbertsville Dam will provide a navigation channel to Pickwick Landing, a distance of 184 miles. The cost is estimated at \$112,000,000. The plan of the Army engineers provided four low dams on this section, estimated to cost \$10,865,000. The low dams would provide a safe 9-foot channel 12 months in the year. Gilbertsville Dam might provide a safe channel during fair weather and cost \$100,000,000 more. From the standpoint of navigation alone, Gilbertsville Dam cannot be defended.

I have used most of the navigation argument of Chairman MANSFIELD, whose knowledge is wider and whose eloquence is greater than mine. I can add but a few facts.

I present here some pictures of typical river barges, such as ply upon the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Monongahela, and the Missouri River. They can go anywhere the Army engineers have made locks and dams. They cannot travel, except with danger and difficulty, upon the wave-swept lakes of the T. V. A. A glance at their shallow freeboard is enough. No member of this committee would risk his life miles from shore on a storm-swept inland sea on a craft like that. Nor would he venture a cargo of his in such circumstances. Neither will the men who own these boats.

Now let us turn to the question of cost. From the standpoint of average volume of flow the Mississippi River is  $10\frac{1}{2}$  times as great as the Tennessee. The Missouri is one and one-half times as large. The Ohio is more than four times as large. These are enormous streams which dwarf the Tennessee. The problem of harnessing them for navigation is obviously much greater and more expensive.

The Army engineers will soon complete a 9-foot channel on the Mississippi from St. Paul to the Gulf of Mexico; on the Missouri from Kansas City to St. Louis; the Illinois waterway from the Mississippi to Chicago; and the entire length of the Ohio River. This 3,500-mile channel job is being completed at the cost of \$650,000,000. Yet the Tennessee, 675 miles long, is going to cost more than all this 3,500 miles of these great rivers.

The Army has harnessed to navigation these mighty rivers at a cost of \$185,700 per mile.

The Army estimates conservatively that it could create a good 9-foot channel from the mouth of the river to where Pickwick Landing Dam now is—the Gilbertsville stretch—for \$10,865,000 with four low, inexpensive dams.

But T. V. A. chooses to do the same job at two and one-half times that cost—\$27,039,000.

The Army can still do the job at \$59,000 per mile. T. V. A. wants to do it for \$147,000 per mile.

The Army job will work; T. V. A.'s proposal will be a positive handicap to navigation.

Gentlemen, in view of these facts I urge you to repeat the position you took last year. Refuse further appropriations for this project. If you do so, you can force T. V. A. to follow the Army recommendations and save the Nation more than \$100,000,000 on what would become a thoroughly defenseless proposition. Production of coal is the major industry in my district and employs about 30,000 men in my district alone. It is a labor-employing industry. Hydro is not. To illustrate, Norris Dam cost \$38,000,000 and now employs less than 20 men. The same amount of money

invested in coal would employ at least 20,000 men. We have set up a National Bituminous Coal Commission to give aid to the sick and distressed bituminous-coal industry, and T. V. A. has become one of its most vicious and dangerous competitors. In the interest of the thousands of coal miners of my district and the hundreds of thousands of others throughout the country I implore you, my colleagues, to stop cutting their throats. [Applause.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time in order to discuss, in more or less detail, the importance of completing the unified program of the Tennessee Valley Authority as contemplated when the act setting up this Authority was passed. I have been living with this subject for almost 20 years and I am tremendously interested in it, not so much on account of the fact that it primarily affects the section from which I come, but in a larger sense, because I look upon it as a great national development which when completed will be perhaps our greatest national asset.

I want to congratulate the committee on bringing out a bill which includes a sufficient sum to start work on the Watts bar dam; however, the bill provides only \$220,000 for Coulter Shoals dam, which is only enough to complete the preliminary work up to the point of beginning actual construction. Already approximately \$500,000 has been expended on preliminary work at Coulter Shoals, and there is every reason in sound economy for providing in this bill the necessary sum to start construction on this project. With the completion of Watts bar and Coulter, we will have then provided a 9-foot channel for navigation from the Ohio River to Knoxville, Tenn. At the proper time, it is my intention to offer an amendment to the bill to provide \$2,000,000 to start the construction of the dam at Coulter Shoals.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that from the standpoint of national defense, the Tennessee Valley development should be rushed to completion as originally contemplated. Unfortunately, it seems to me, practically all of our arsenals, munition, and airplane plants are located in too close proximity to our seaboard, which renders them of easy access to enemy aircraft.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he is going to offer an amendment to start another dam down there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. No. It is one of the dams that was originally recommended by the engineer division of the War Department under a Republican administration.

Mr. KNUTSON. We understood that the Gilbertsville Dam would be the last dam asked for. What is this, a kind of rubber project?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. No. This provides navigation up to Knoxville, Tenn., as originally planned.

Mr. KNUTSON. How many dams have been built down there, and how many are going to be built altogether?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. These dams, Watts bar and Coulter, complete the series of dams.

The location of these plants far inland to reduce the vulnerability of enemy attack is of the utmost importance, it seems to me. The Tennessee Valley affords a perfect setting for headquarters for the manufacture of munitions and airplanes. During the World War the War Department made a survey to determine suitable locations for munition factories, and of the nine sites recommended, eight of them were in the Tennessee Valley and the other one was nearby. The valley, situated in almost the center of eastern United States, would be protected by a veritable ring of Army posts and air bases on three sides, and by the 6,000-foot Appalachian chain of mountains on the east, in the event of national emergency. The vast sources of hydroelectric power within the valley not only makes possible cheap manufacture of munitions, but with large deposits of copper ore, zinc, and iron, both in east Tennessee and Alabama, together with a large aluminum processing plant at Alcoa, would simplify greatly the manufacture of

airplanes. Other factors which enter into making the valley a center of munitions manufacture are nitric and sulphuric acids, which are produced in large quantities in the valley from raw materials which are found there in abundance. From them come explosives such as guncotton, picric acid, dynamite, TNT, smokeless powder, and cordite.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Is the Federal Government going to run these plants and factories the gentleman speaks of?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I should certainly think so; of course, it would.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What has become of the plan suggested by the Army engineers originally providing improvement of the Tennessee River for a total of \$77,000,000?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I do not know what the plans are to which the gentleman has reference, but certainly this development could not have been done for any \$77,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. I refer to the original plan of the Board of Army Engineers for the development of the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Some development might have been had for \$77,000,000, but not the development that has been carried on, and is being carried on now.

Mr. DONDERO. It did not include power. This plan is going to cost us nearly \$1,000,000,000 before we are through.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Oh, no. The entire system will cost less than half that amount.

From the huge phosphate deposits in the valley would come toxic gases, incendiary shells, flare signals, smoke-screen bases, and tracer bullets. Essential to the full development of all this, however, is the navigation which the two last dams in the series will provide.

#### COULTER SHOALS DAM

When we passed the Tennessee Valley Authority Act we undertook to extend a permanent 9-foot navigation from the Ohio River to Knoxville, a distance of 646 miles, by means of locks and dams. We have provided for 602 miles of this distance but the Coulter Shoals dam, furnishing the last 44 miles of the navigation, has not been provided for, and I think that you will agree with me that a navigation improvement, like a railroad, to be successful must go somewhere.

If we stop at Watts bar we are carrying our navigation program 602 miles and then leaving it at a point that is no place in particular. We are still 44 miles short of reaching Knoxville, and it is Knoxville which may be expected to furnish the largest part of our traffic.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. This is going to be a power project, is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. No; there will be no primary power generated at Coulter Shoals. This is, in the main, a navigation and flood-control project.

Mr. THORKELOSON. But the project and all the industries would be owned by the Government?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. It would be owned by the Government, as it should be.

Mr. KNUTSON. It would be susceptible of development for power purposes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. There would be secondary power, of course.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman have any coal in his district?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Yes; and one of the reasons I am supporting this measure is because it will relieve the coal situation which has been very distressful.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman thinks the electric power which will be developed will make the coal business prosperous?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. No; I do not take that position, but I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that if we open navigation to Knoxville that will afford an outlet for our coal production, that will afford us an unlimited market.

Mr. KNUTSON. How much is the whole project going to cost?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. At Coulter Shoals?

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I mean the whole Tennessee Valley project.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I have not taken the time to figure it up.

Mr. KNUTSON. It will be over \$500,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Oh, I would say it would be much less than that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Those are the figures given me by the experts at my right.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I am afraid the gentleman is prejudiced against this project for some reason.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman figures that \$500,000,000 at 3-percent interest, that means \$15,000,000 a year, not counting the cost of operation, wear, tear, and replacement.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I shall not yield any further to the gentleman because I am satisfied anything I may say would not change his attitude.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think it would pay the Government to hire people to carry that coal out in bushel baskets.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I know the gentleman feels that way about it. If he cannot attack the Tennessee Valley Authority with logic, he attempts to do so by ridicule.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, no.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I do not yield further.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is doing me an injustice.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. If I have done the gentleman an injustice, it was certainly unintentional, and I most humbly apologize.

Although the Tennessee River navigation is now broken into short, disconnected parts, commerce is already trying to use the river. The Gulf Refining Co. has provided terminals and barge transportation for oil from the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers as far up the Tennessee as Guntersville, and they would continue on up to Knoxville if the navigation was completed. As soon as the Guntersville, Chickamauga, and Watts bar dams are finished, these modern barges of the oil company can come within 44 miles of Knoxville, but there they must stop. Why not build the Coulter Shoals dam so the traffic can go on to Knoxville? Already the people of Knoxville are looking forward to the completion of this waterway and are making plans to use it. Frontages have been purchased in Knoxville for warehouses and terminals and more purchases would be made except for the fact that many fear that this Coulter Shoals dam will not be built.

We have authorized the Tennessee Valley Authority to charge a part of the cost of each of the eight Tennessee River dams to navigation. This has now been done, and the Authority has charged many million dollars in this way on the theory that we have a navigation improvement worth this amount of money, but no navigation improvement can have its true commercial value until it provides a deep and permanent channel all the way up to its principal source of freight.

While there are other important points on the Tennessee River, the chief source of prospective freight is Knoxville, and this economical and desirable dam at Coulter Shoals should be built at this time so that when the Watts bar dam is completed and we have provided commercial navigation from the Ohio for a distance of 600 miles up the Tennessee River, we will not discover that we have brought our modern inland water transportation to within 44 miles of the terminal and left it stranded almost within sight of the freight which awaits it at the port of Knoxville. Only by completing our navigation project can we justify the expenditures that we have already made for the improvement of the Tennessee River navigation.

If we stop here, after providing 9-foot navigation for 600 miles, and leave 2-foot navigation for the remainder, it would be like completing a railroad and stopping at 44 miles from



the terminal. I think that that illustration is not at all overdrawn, for we can have no navigation on the Tennessee up to Knoxville until Watts bar and Coulter Shoals dams are completed, and we may expect that the bulk of the navigation traffic, perhaps 90 percent, will originate in Knoxville, Tenn. The Chickamauga Dam, which is an important navigation dam, will be absolutely useless so far as navigation is concerned unless the Watts bar and Coulter Shoals dams are constructed, for the backwater from Chickamauga goes nowhere and would leave the head of the 9-foot navigation at no point in particular.

The records of navigation traffic at the Pickwick Landing dam, 200 miles above the mouth of the river, show that the tonnage through the locks has increased every month since the locks were placed in service in February 1938. In the first month 1,000 tons moved through the lock. This amount increased month by month until 21,000 tons passed through the locks in November. Shippers, manufacturers, and barge-line operators are increasing their business and would extend their operation to Knoxville if the 9-foot channel was available. Gasoline, structural steel, pig iron, lumber, sawlogs, and other commodities are being transported by the river. The saving in freight or gasoline alone would amount to about 60 percent, and a proportional saving would be made on other commodities as compared with rail transportation.

The mineral reserves of the Tennessee Valley within from 5 to 15 miles of the navigable waterways of the Tennessee River and tributaries were given by the Army engineers and show that more than 2,000,000,000 tons of useful minerals are available. Of many of these minerals the supply is conceded by the engineers to be inexhaustible. With others the exact extent of the reserve is unknown, but the quantity is known to be enormous. A summary of the important minerals is as follows:

Minerals	Production, 1926	Mineral reserves at present available
	Tons	Tons
Asphalt rock.....	23,600	17,000,000
Barite.....	47,000	(1)
Bauxite.....	500	700,000
Clay.....	63,000	(1)
Coal.....	11,991,000	1,835,000,000
Iron ore.....	166,000	169,047,000
Limestone.....	2,152,000	(2)
Manganese.....	2,000	55,000
Marble.....	72,000	(2)
Phosphate rock.....	460,000	92,400,000
Sand and gravel.....	1,643,000	(2)
Slate.....	27,800	(1)
Zinc ore.....	822,000	45,000,000
Total.....	17,489,900	2,159,202,000

<sup>1</sup> Unknown.

<sup>2</sup> Inexhaustible.

<sup>3</sup> Large.

A large part of the coal and iron ore of the basin is so located that provision may be made for direct loading upon the Tennessee River or its tributaries by extension of tracks for the mining cars, or by cable or light railway, and so forth. This applies in particular to the heaviest producing fields adjacent to the upper Tennessee, Clinch, and Powell Rivers, and to the very productive fields of the upper Cumberland adjacent thereto. A large part of the less productive coal area is, however, located in the eastern part of the Cumberland Mountains not so readily accessible to the river.

It is well known that freight can move three times as far by water as by rail at the same cost, and our wisdom in providing for the permanent improvement of our inland waterways is being demonstrated more and more every year. The Mississippi system carried nearly three times the tonnage in 1936 that it did in 1920. The Illinois River traffic multiplied 10 times in 10 years. It has been well said that new transportation creates new business, and it is a well-known fact that of the 39 counties in the United States which make half of the total manufactured products of the Nation, 35 have water transportation. It is significant that these 39 counties have 40 percent of the total buying power of the United States, due, in part, at least, to their transportation advantages.

Navigation traffic on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers has been increasing rapidly in recent years. In 1922 the Army engineers found that the total traffic on the Ohio-Mississippi system was about 17,000,000 tons; in 1936 it had increased to 74,000,000 tons, an increase of 57,000,000 tons in 14 years. In other words, the traffic has increased 100 percent over the 1922 figure every 5 years. The Tennessee River as shown by this map is directly connected to the Ohio-Mississippi system and a similar showing can be expected. In fact, the Army engineers have estimated that within the next 11 years the traffic on the Tennessee River alone will amount to 17,000,000 tons a year, or as much as the entire commerce of the Ohio and Mississippi systems in 1922.

But it is not only the completion of this outstanding navigation project on which we have worked so many years that justifies the immediate construction of Coulter Shoals dam, it is also an important part of the flood-control program. On March 11, 1867, the city of Chattanooga experienced the most destructive flood in her recorded history. Boats were paddled through Market Street, which is the principal business street of the city. The damage was enormous. From time to time there has been a recurrence of high water in Chattanooga and other cities along the Tennessee River. The recent flood in Paducah, for instance, at the mouth of the Tennessee River, is estimated to have caused a loss of \$25,000,000. Flood control is therefore an important part of the improvement program of the Tennessee. Several years ago President Hoover detailed Lt. Col. M. C. Tyler, now Brigadier General Tyler, acting Chief Engineer in the War Department, to report to the Muscle Shoals Commission of 1931 regarding various features of the Tennessee River improvement, including flood control. Colonel Tyler pointed out that what is known as the Norris Dam development can reduce floods which originate in the Clinch River only. The Norris Dam, however, has an important effect in reducing flood levels at Chattanooga and further down the river. The area which is drained by the Tennessee River and tributaries above the site of this proposed Coulter Shoals dam is more than three times as great as the drainage area above Norris Dam, for Coulter Shoals is in the main stream and above it are the Holston and French Broad Rivers. So it is not surprising that Colonel Tyler found that the flood-control storage capacity of the Coulter Shoals dam, the Watts bar dam, and the Chickamauga Dam will afford greater flood protection to the city of Chattanooga in the great majority of floods than will the Norris Reservoir.

We have been told that it is impossible for the same dam to be used for flood control and water power at the same time, but if we cannot have them both from Norris Dam—which I deny, for I think it is entirely possible—then here is a remedy, for these three mainstream dams offer greater flood protection to Chattanooga than the Norris Reservoir—but not without Coulter Shoals.

Colonel Tyler did not say that two of these projects would accomplish this purpose, but declared that it would require all three of them; and with these three dams, along with the Norris Dam, the flood control for Chattanooga is absolutely solved.

The value of flood control on the Tennessee was demonstrated in a dramatic way at Cairo, Ill., in March 1936, when the river was kept out by a mud box on top of the protection dykes. The Tennessee River dams which we have built reduced the flood stage almost 6 inches and the water did not overtop the dyke, although the waves were lapping at its very crest. It is impossible to name a figure which will represent the value of reducing the flood crest 6 inches under the desperate conditions that prevailed at Cairo. If the dyke had broken, the city would have been flooded to the second story of the houses and the loss would have been at least \$15,000,000, to say nothing of the risk to the lives and health of the people. No public work that I can think of will represent a more sound and justifiable expenditure than these combined navigation flood-control dams on our inland streams. These dams provide a control program that will take as much as 2 feet, and perhaps more, off the crest of the Mississippi floods

below Cairo, and he would be bold who would undertake to say what the value of this 2-foot margin of safety may be in the future along the lower Mississippi River. It has been estimated by the T. V. A. at \$380,000,000, and I think that the estimate is probably conservative.

There is a particular reason why the construction of this Coulter Shoals dam should be definitely provided for at this time. We have already spent a great deal of money in preliminary work. Approximately \$500,000 has been expended in geological and other investigations in connection with Coulter Shoals, and the Tennessee Valley Authority reports that its consulting geologists find that there are no difficulties at this site which cannot be overcome. The Authority has prepared a schedule of construction operations presented in the form of a diagram which shows that about the middle of this coming year—1940—we may expect the completion of the Guntersville Dam, the Chickamauga Dam, and the Fowler Bend dam on the Hiwassee River. That means the construction forces and equipment from three dams will be released. If an appropriation for Coulter Shoals is made at this time, this organized, trained force can move right up to Watts bar and Coulter Shoals. But if only the Watts bar is provided for there will be equipment from three dams available and only one new project provided for, with the result that we will have more unemployment in the Tennessee Valley and valuable construction equipment will stand idle.

Coulter Shoals and Watts bar should be built together, just as the Guntersville and Chickamauga Dams are being built together; with the large overhead of the Tennessee Valley Authority one does not need to be an accountant to realize that the construction work should be pushed as rapidly as possible. The last annual report of the T. V. A. includes a list of 4,412 employees of the T. V. A. whose salaries are \$1,500 a year or more. Probably the overhead of the Tennessee Valley Authority will exceed a million dollars a month. Surely the construction of dams should continue as rapidly as possible, for such a pay roll can be justified only by continuing large-scale operations and completing this construction work as rapidly as possible with this trained organization which the T. V. A. has built up at great expense.

No part of the general program of the administration for the betterment of our country has received greater public approval than the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority, but to enable the Authority to finish its construction program for the completion of navigation improvement and the flood control of the Tennessee River at reasonable cost, we should make this appropriation and start the final dam of the series at this time so that the benefits of the completed project may be made available not only to the Tennessee Valley, but to the millions of people who live along the lower Mississippi River, without further delay.

I have not mentioned the subject of electric power for this dam is not primarily a power dam; however, since the purchase of the properties of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. by the T. V. A. the controversy as to power has been eliminated. It will have its place, of course, in the power program and the water power will not be allowed to run to waste, but "no chain is stronger than its weakest link," and the navigation program of the Tennessee River without Coulter Shoals Dam would be a reflection upon the foresight of this House in its plans for the improvement of our inland waterways. Whether we consider navigation, flood control, power development, or the economical expenditure of funds by the Tennessee Valley Authority, we are bound to conclude that it would be a mistake to postpone the appropriation of the small amount of money necessary to start the construction of this dam and finish the job while it can be done with a minimum of cost.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the completion of this navigation project as recommended by the engineers of the War Department is a part of manifest destiny, and whether we do it now or later, it will ultimately come. I have explained heretofore in my remarks that it

can be accomplished much more economically now than if postponed to some later date.

When the Muscle Shoals bill was passed in 1928 I went to the White House and pleaded with Mr. Coolidge to approve it. I explained to him that this development was inevitable, but for reasons satisfactory to himself he declined to do so. When the bill was passed again in 1931 I importuned President Hoover to give it his sanction, but he declined to do so. I reminded President Hoover, as I had reminded President Coolidge, that the development was manifest destiny, and therefore inevitable, but my appeal was of no avail.

Speaking to my Republican colleagues, I want to say that the action of our leaders on the Tennessee Valley development has seriously jeopardized our party in this area. I represent a district that has not sent a Democrat to Congress since the Civil War, yet in the election of 1936 Mr. Roosevelt carried my district by 8,000 majority, and this was due largely, in my opinion, to the attitude of our leaders on Tennessee Valley development.

I want to again remind my Republican colleagues that the completion of the Tennessee River development, as outlined by the engineers of the War Department under a Republican administration, is inevitable, and I trust they will join me in the completion of this program. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, what little I have to say this afternoon is in connection with the National Labor Relations Board. I am not unmindful of the fact that it is probably the most maligned governmental institution that has been set up since President Roosevelt became President of the United States; but I recall a similar situation when the Federal Trade Commission was set up during the Wilson administration. It was likewise misrepresented and it was likewise maligned. The claim was made it would not be of any benefit to the people of the country. Mr. Chairman, it has proven to be one of the greatest agencies for breaking up combinations, such as trusts, in restraint of trade that the Government of the United States ever brought into being.

Mr. Chairman, the National Labor Relations Board was created for the purpose of preventing strikes, contentions, and strife of all kinds as between employer and employee, making the public the "goat." If you will pardon my referring to myself personally, may I say that during the war I worked as special counsel for the Federal Trade Commission in Washington. I found in many instances that subordinates in the employ of the Federal Trade Commission, either accidentally, or officiously brought about a feeling of antagonism against the Commission among the industrialists who were trying to live within the law and trying to obey the law. I imagine if the truth were known, much of the criticism directed against the present Labor Board is due to such tactics on the part of subordinates working for the Board. So in approaching the subject we want to bear in mind the fact there are many people in its employ, assuming in many instances authority they do not have, authority they do not possess, and authority which the Congress has not given them or that the Labor Board has not given them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to specific things to show that this Board has done a lot of good work and has prevented in many instances strikes throughout the country that would have been devastating, not only to the employee but to the employer and likewise the American public. The critics of the National Labor Relations Board have repeatedly assailed that Board as unfair to the employer and partial to labor. They point to the comparatively few decisions in which the Board finds in favor of the employer. While that statement is true the inference is partially misleading.

It overlooks the fact that each case decided by the Board has passed through an intense elimination and sifting process before it is passed upon by the Board. The truth of the matter is easily uncovered by reference to the record and procedure of the Board. I believe if you will study this law and compare it with the Federal Trade Commission Act, you will find them both working in the same fashion and along the same line of procedure.



Since its inception the Board has disposed of 15,082 cases. Let us follow through and see how the Board pans and sifts its findings and orders in these cases. A union files with the regional director of one of the Board's 22 regional offices a charge on behalf of employees of a certain plant. The charge is kept secret during its investigation in order to protect whom? To protect the employer from embarrassment by the mere accusation, the same procedure adopted by the Federal Trade Commission.

Every source of information is tapped by the director or his representatives in an effort to get all the facts which prompted the charge. If at any time during his investigation the director finds that the charge has no merit, he is empowered to dismiss it. The director is empowered to do that, or he may persuade the union to withdraw its charge. That this is not a mere gesture is evidenced by the fact that, of the 15,082 cases handled, about 6,300 have been withdrawn or dismissed in this manner, just the same as what happens when the Federal Trade Commission is investigating.

If the investigation, in the course of which the employer and employee representatives are questioned, reveals a substantial basis for the charge, the director endeavors to persuade the employer to comply with the provisions of the act. In other words, he holds out the olive branch of peace. Failing this, the employer is sent a formal complaint, the same as in the case of the Federal Trade Commission, together with notice of hearing.

It is here that formal action is first taken by the Board. Until that stage is reached the Board has nothing to do with the case. However, in the majority of cases the employer and his employees come to an agreement before commencement of the hearing. Of its 15,082 cases, the Board has disposed of 7,931 by agreement of both parties, which is done by the Federal Trade Commission in the same fashion. These cases rarely make the news and never make the headlines. As the fellow says, they simply make peace. Of the 15,082 closed cases, only 853 went to formal proceedings. They represent the instances where investigation has revealed a strong probability of wrongdoing and where the employer refused to comply with the law. They give a chance to a person or corporation to mend his ways, just the same as the Federal Trade Commission gives a chance to a person or corporation who violates the Clayton amendment to the Sherman Antitrust Act to mend his ways. The Board holds a hearing, which is open to the public, presided over by a trial examiner sent from Washington.

Mr. THORKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am extremely sorry I cannot yield to my colleague, due to lack of time.

All parties are given full opportunity to present witnesses, to examine, and to cross-examine. At the conclusion of the hearing the trial examiner makes a report to the Board which is served upon both parties. This procedure is identical with that of the Federal Trade Commission.

If the examiner finds the employer guilty of a violation of the act, he will recommend what action the employer should take to remedy the situation. He actually talks to the employer. If the employer complies with these recommendations, the case comes to an end. If the employer takes exception to this report, the case finally comes before the Board itself for decision. If the Board finds against the employer, it issues an order requiring him to observe certain conditions in harmony with the declared public policy. The only order this Board can issue is the identical order the Federal Trade Commission issues, namely, to cease and desist from that practice.

Inevitably, after such a meticulous sifting process and when advantage is not taken of repeated full opportunity to conform to the law of the land, the decisions of the Board will reflect the evidence investigated by the regional director, confirmed by testimony in a full and fair hearing, and formally found by the trial examiner. Now, Members of Congress, the significant thing about this whole set-up is the fact that out of 15,082 cases the Board has issued cease and desist orders in only 6 percent of them, showing that the

ultimate object of this Board is peace between employer and employee, with no injury to the public.

On June 30, 1937, the number of cases pending was 2,202. The number of cases received between July 1, 1937, and June 30, 1938, was 10,430. This makes a total of 12,632. Of this number, 4,428 were closed by settlement, 1,368 were dismissed, 2,124 were withdrawn, and 122 were transferred to other agencies, making a total of 8,042 cases closed in the last fiscal year before formal action.

The total number of cases closed after formal action was 809, or a grand total of 8,851 cases closed during the last fiscal year. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, the National Labor Relations Board has been criticized, and a great deal of the criticism has not been constructive. I do not hesitate to say this Board has benefited not only the employees but also the employers. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I hope the National Labor Relations Board will receive the funds necessary to continue the good work it has carried on since its inception.

I have introduced the following bill:

A bill to provide \$30,000,000,000, which shall be expended within a period of 5 years to furnish employment and to end poverty in the United States and its possessions

Whereas there are many millions of persons unemployed in the United States and many of those who are unemployed are young men and women, and, because of this unemployment situation, men and women have been compelled to go into bread lines and do many other things which are humiliating to them; and

Whereas there is an abundance of the necessities of life and yet many of our citizens are compelled to go hungry; and

Whereas this human misery has been brought about because our people have been unable to find employment; and

Whereas if we became engaged in war we would spend billions of dollars in the destruction of humanity and property; and

Whereas if we spend billions of dollars for construction purposes we would be promoting the welfare of mankind: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That \$30,000,000,000 shall be expended by the Federal Government within a period of 5 years to provide employment and to end poverty in the United States.

Sec. 2. The money shall be expended for the prevention of floods, forest fires, dust storms, and soil erosion; purification of rivers and streams; slum clearance; construction of homes that can be sold or rented at reasonable cost, schools, hospitals, parks, roads, bridges, reservoirs, canals, tunnels, subways, and disposal plants; elimination of dangerous grade crossings; rural electrification; the purchase of railroads and other utilities which shall be owned by the Government; development of our natural resources; and for medical, surgical, dental, biological, geological, and every other art and science and for every other purpose which will solve the unemployment problem and promote the welfare of the people of our country.

Sec. 3. No person employed by the Federal Government under the provisions of this act shall be compelled to work more than 5 days per week nor more than 6 hours in any one day and the wage paid shall be no less than 75 cents per hour, and all persons employed shall receive 1 month vacation every year with pay.

Sec. 4. Union organizations must be recognized under this act.

Sec. 5. The President of the United States shall be authorized to appoint a committee of at least five members or as many as he believes is necessary, to devise ways and means to secure the money to carry out the provisions of this act. It shall be the duty of the committee to obtain the said money from such sources which will work the least hardship on the taxpayers of our country.

Sec. 6. This act shall become effective within 90 days after its passage.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESSANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Chairman, my attention was called to a pamphlet which is being circularized to the veterans throughout the State of Maryland relating to an appropriation for a veterans' hospital for Baltimore, Md. I want to take this opportunity to make my position clear.

On Tuesday, January 24, 1939, a meeting was called by United States Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, and every member of the Maryland delegation was present and pledged himself to support this appropriation. I feel the same now as I did when I signed this statement. I am heartily in accord with this appropriation and shall continue to support it and work for its passage.

I was unable to be present at a meeting of the Maryland delegation called by Senator TYDINGS at his office on Monday, January 30, due to illness. However, at the proper time I wish to extend my remarks and place in the RECORD a statement presented at the hearing before the Committee on Appropriations on January 24, 1939, signed by the Maryland delegation; also a copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, with which I am heartily in accord. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the documents to which I refer are as follows:

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1939.

STATEMENT OF HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND; HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND; AND HON. T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH, HON. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR., HON. AMBROSE J. KENNEDY, HON. THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO, JR., AND HON. WILLIAM D. BYRON, REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. WOODRUM. There has been presented to me a statement, signed by the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Maryland, urging the construction of a veterans' hospital at Baltimore, Md. The statement will be inserted in the record.

The statement referred to is as follows:

"The undersigned United States Senators and Representatives, comprising the entire delegation from the State of Maryland, request the support of your committee in providing the necessary funds for the erection at an early date of a veterans' hospital in or near Baltimore, Md.

"The Federal Board of Hospitalization, following extensive study and hearings, approved the construction of a 300-bed Veterans' Administration facility. The immediate and increasing need for such an accommodation to our veterans and the early date of hearings before your committee has suggested the wisdom of our appearance here in advance of a recommendation from the Acting Director of the Budget, where the request for funds is now pending.

"On March 24, 1932, shortly after the passage of the act of 1931, authorizing \$20,877,000 to be appropriated for hospital construction, the Maryland delegation in Congress made its first appearance before the Federal Board of Hospitalization. We were supported at that time by testimony from many of the leading citizens of Maryland, especially representatives of our service organizations. Gen. Frank T. Hines, chairman, and his associates of the Federal Board of Hospitalization, found it impossible to include Maryland in the allocation of the 1931 appropriation.

"We accepted this decision without complaint, because we have at all times been impressed with the fairness displayed by General Hines and his associates. When it became apparent additional funds would be available for veterans' hospital construction through national emergency appropriations, we renewed our efforts to bring about a finding favorable to the erection of a new hospital in or near Baltimore. This effort took form in the introduction by Senator TYDINGS and Congressman COLE as companion legislation to authorize the erection of a veterans' hospital in or near Baltimore.

"Pending consideration of these measures, a further hearing before the Federal Board of Hospitalization was held on June 10, 1938. At this hearing Senator TYDINGS presented the delegation from Maryland, headed by the Governor of the State, the mayor of Baltimore, leading representatives of our service, and civic organizations, and the congressional delegation, in all about 250. The necessity for and the advisability of a new hospital in or near Baltimore was again gone into most fully.

"We are happy to be able to report that following the hearings on June 10, 1938, the Federal Board of Hospitalization recommended the construction of a Veterans' Administration facility of 300 beds in the vicinity of Baltimore.

"During the summer of 1938, the Acting Director of the Budget was requested to allot funds through P. W. A. for this and other hospital construction work throughout the country. The request for Maryland along with but one other was returned to the Veterans' Administration because additional P. W. A. funds were not available.

"We are most reliably informed that a renewal of the request of the Acting Director of the Budget has been made for additional funds to carry through to completion the decision favorable to relieving the situation now facing the veterans of Maryland. We are advised that such funds might, if not all, then in part, be available through savings on the projects now under contract and approved by the President and the Budget.

"With the knowledge that this much-needed new veterans' hospital in or near Baltimore has received the approval, as to the necessity for it, of the Federal Board of Hospitalization, which Board we are sure enjoys the highest respect and esteem at your hands, we earnestly request, if such is compatible with the practice you pursue in drafting appropriation bills, to make available at this time the funds necessary for the construction of a veterans' facility in or near Baltimore, in accordance to the findings referred to above.

"We are cognizant of the fact that at this date the application for the necessary funds amounting to approximately \$1,300,000, so we are advised, is without the approval of the President or the Acting Director of the Budget. The undersigned have been in touch with the Acting Director of the Budget and also anticipate an early conference with the President. In view of the favorable consideration we anticipate and the admitted merit the claim for a new hospital in or near Baltimore possessed, we earnestly appeal for such

favorable consideration by your committee as you can give at this time.

"We have deliberately refrained from incorporating in this statement statistics pertaining to the military population of Maryland, the necessity for additional beds and other conditions, because of the previous finding by the Federal Board of Hospitalization, to which we respectfully refer your committee if a basis for the findings of the Board favorable to the location of the new hospital in or near Baltimore is desired."

Resolution requesting the United States Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to construct a United States Veterans' Bureau general medical and surgical hospital in the city of Baltimore or elsewhere in the State of Maryland

Whereas the Congress of the United States has appropriated a fund for the construction of Veterans' Bureau hospitals in the various parts of the United States; and

Whereas the location of these hospitals has been left to the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and

Whereas there is no Veterans' Bureau general medical and surgical hospital located within the boundaries of the State of Maryland; and

Whereas there are at the present time 502 veterans in Maryland who have made application for treatment in general hospitals and who cannot be cared for because there are no beds available; and

Whereas the United States Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has recommended to the President of the United States that there be constructed a United States Veterans' Bureau general medical and surgical hospital in the city of Baltimore or elsewhere in the State of Maryland; Therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of Baltimore, That the city of Baltimore does hereby petition the President of the United States to approve the recommendation of the United States Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to cause to be constructed a Veterans' Bureau general medical and surgical hospital of not less than 300- to 500-bed capacity in the city of Baltimore or elsewhere in the State of Maryland; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the council is hereby requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the United States Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to the Maryland representatives of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 45 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first regular appropriation bill in the Seventy-sixth Congress. This bill carries appropriations for some 40 different independent agencies of the Government.

No man can sit on the Committee on Appropriations and listen to the amazing and perplexing testimony from agencies that are expending annually in excess of \$1,500,000,000 of the people's money without appreciating a statement a bishop in New York once made about the institutional church. He said it had got so big and so bewildering that God got lost in the machinery. I never sit in a group of hearings in the Appropriations Committee but that somehow or other I feel that I sometimes get lost in the machinery, like a great many other people lost in the labyrinthine functions of this great institution we call the United States Government.

Let me first pay a little testimony to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable CLIFTON WOODRUM, of Virginia. In my considered judgment, the gentleman from Virginia is one of the ablest Members of this House. Along with that, he has demonstrated fairness to the minority at every stage of the proceeding, so we cherish for him a real respect, admiration, and devotion. There are lots of times in the course of a hearing when we undertake to get from witnesses information that may appear prejudicial, or may appear to some, perhaps, as having a partisan and political tinge. Of course, it becomes necessary for the chairman to rule and to indicate whether witnesses ought to proceed under such a line of questioning. Almost invariably, however, the chairman in the interest of fairness has ruled on our side, and we of the minority pay our little tribute to him for that sense of fairness which has been one of the great attributes of the Appropriations Committee.

It is a liberal education to sit in the hearings on this particular bill involving some 40 agencies. The bill includes, among other things, an appropriation for repairing the roof on the largest museum in the world, where the collections are inventoried at \$130,000,000 and where 2,500,000 people come every year to see everything from the skeleton of a dinosaur to the Lindbergh plane that flew the Atlantic some years ago. It contains appropriations for cleaning out the alley slums in Washington, D. C. It contains appropriations



to recapture oil lands that were alienated from the Government a great many years ago and on which we have spent sundry thousands of dollars in the hope they can be recaptured in the interest of naval oil reserves. It includes appropriations and authorizations for the acquisition of land in the Nation's Capital so that it might be properly expanded without too great expense upon the taxpayers. It includes that great inland empire that has been discussed here today, known as the Tennessee Valley Authority, which, today, owns 500,000 acres of land, and if they acquire much more and put much more concrete and water down in the State of Tennessee there probably will not be any place for the people to live and some of our good Members will have to take their constituencies elsewhere.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would rather not. I am coming to that matter later.

Mr. MAY. I want to refer to the flood that happened night before last.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It includes the Veterans' Administration. It includes what will ultimately be one of the most important adjuncts of this country, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, which is more or less in the infant stage in this country as compared with Italy and Germany.

It includes pensions for railroad men and funds to bring electric power to homes and firesides in obscure and unserved villages and hamlets; it includes funds to adjudicate the labor troubles of sailors on the high seas; it includes funds to make maps in Alabama and to experiment with freezing strawberries in Tennessee; it includes funds to complete the controversial monument to Thomas Jefferson even though the sacred cherry trees may have to suffer; it includes funds for the establishment of air navigation facilities in Alaska and for completing the sculpturing of a marble mountainside in South Dakota where 10,000 years hence posterity may look upon the handiwork of this generation and wondering what strange people occupied this section of the earth in 1939; it includes funds to pay injuries to C. C. C. workers and to mediate railroad disputes.

So when you sit in the hearings on this bill, you get a liberal education for weeks and weeks as you examine department heads and find out what makes the wheels of Government move. Then, of course, all of the information, both on the record and off, consisting of more than 2,100 pages, is finally compressed into a report from which you are expected to glean the substance of this bill. As I first examined that report I felt it was one of the finest that has ever been drawn up by any subcommittee or any clerk, and I am going to pay a little tribute to the clerk of this committee, Mr. Arthur Orr. He is faithful, he is diligent, he is able, and this report is somewhat of a monument to his diligence and capacity. I am sure the rest of the members of the subcommittee join me in my respect for him and for the ability with which he is serving the Congress and, particularly, the Appropriations Committee.

Now, when you consider this bill you reach some rather general conclusions. Some of them I have stated over a period of years, and I am going to restate them because I believe they will bear emphasis.

The first one is this. There is something just a little bit farcical at times about the way we are constrained to get information out of the Government departments. Here comes the Social Security Board, with thousands of people on the pay roll, administering old-age insurance, unemployment compensation, old-age assistance, the welfare of mothers and crippled children and dependent children, and when they range themselves on the opposite side of the committee for cross-examination the very best we can do is, by a species of examination, secure from them a skeleton factual picture of what is going on in that Board. We have to do the same thing with the Rural Electrification Administration, that had \$40,000,000 and, in addition, \$100,000,000 of advances from the R. F. C. They can put it all on paper. You can set down a very beautiful balance sheet, but it does not indicate to the people's representatives precisely what is going on in the Government, and it would not be too much to ask that at

least a million dollars be set aside so that the legislative branch of the Government could hire experts at salaries that experts will command, and without any niggardliness on our part, so they can dip into the processes of government and find out whether these appropriations that are made from year to year are efficiently administered and efficiently expended. There is no other way in which to do it. The legislative structure of government is weak in this respect, and the time will come, if we ever expect to secure a maximum of efficiency in expenditure, which must manifestly be the forerunner of economy, then we must have some other legislative adjunct to this House, so that we can send them into the departments, let them make an investigation—not for a week, not for a month or 2 or 3 months—but to be investigating all the time, and then report to the Congress, and particularly to the Appropriations Committee.

This is one of the things I see. The other basic conclusion is this: Sooner or later there must be some consolidation.

We have, for instance, administering the various electric functions of the Government, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Electric Home and Farm Authority. We have the Bonneville Dam, we have this great instrumentality known as the Grand Coulee, we have the Fort Peck power project, we have the Federal Power Commission, and I assume that there are other instrumentalities of government that are engaged in the same kind of administration of power facilities for the people of this country. Why can there not be a consolidation? I see no reason why not. It would be in the interest of eliminating duplication in the Government, and certainly it would save money for the taxpayers.

The same thing is true in the field of housing. This bill contains appropriations for the Federal Housing Authority. In the Department of the Interior there is the United States Housing Authority. In the Department of Agriculture there is the Resettlement Administration and also what is left of the subsistence homes project, like Greenbelt, in Maryland, or the one in Pennsylvania, or Arthurdale, or Reedsville in West Virginia—all dealing with housing or some aspect of housing; and I fancy we could do a great job for the taxpayers of this country if a committee, perhaps the Appropriations Committee, might set itself diligently to the task for a while in the hope that all of these functions that are purveyed to the people in one form or another can be harmonized and put in their proper sphere, in the interest of savings for the taxpayers. Those are things that somehow press themselves on your attention and emphasize themselves year after year, and we are not going to function as efficiently as we should until some of those consolidations are effected.

There are some things in this bill that require special emphasis. I am going to group the first of them and hang a few ideas upon the talk that has been appearing in the contemporary press about the danger of taking this country into war. In this bill, first of all, is an appropriation of \$140,000 for the American Battle Monuments Commission. It never receives any discussion, because it is efficiently administered. They do not spend too much for travel or for personal services, and it is one of those things we gloss over, but I want you to go back into the hearings and read the very brief report of the American Battle Monuments Commission, because it administers 12 war memorials, 8 war cemeteries in Europe, 6 of them in France, 1 in Belgium, and 1 in England. There are something over 30,000 of our boys sleeping over there today, and this is not too much money for them. But what I want to bring to your attention this afternoon very briefly as this hysteria of war mongering sweeps across the country is the fact that there are a little over 30,000 over there who are casualties of the last war. They are comrades of mine, because I spent 17 months over there fighting along with them, and when you think of those sacrifices it makes dim and dull the jingoistic spirit and desire of anybody to ever rush this country into war. [Applause.] There is an item in this bill—a related item, for Veterans' Administration—that was delineated at considerable length by the chairman of the subcommittee.

We are spending \$420,000,000 in the form of pensions for those who fought the battles of the Nation, and if you go back and break down the tables that come from the Veterans' Administration, you will find there are 393,135 World War veterans that are receiving compensation from their Government today; and in addition thereto there are 110,940 dependents of veterans receiving compensation, so that the total for the World War, which was just 21 years ago, is 504,075. Think of it. Over a half million of our veterans and their dependents who are on the pension rolls today because the disintegrating seed of war has been implanted in them. They are what I refer to as the great legion of despair, for whom no armistice will ever be signed. Oh, I tell you that takes some of that spirit out of you when they talk about projecting this country into war and probably fixing our frontier a good many miles from where it is at the present time. There is the record. But there is an even more ghastly record in these prosaic figures that come from the Veterans' Administration. These tables are in the hearings. Get yourselves a copy and take it home with you this summer. The Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion will be expecting you to make speeches at these district meetings and at these picnics. There is material for the speeches. There is one which is agonizing and ghastly, which I regard as the most tragic of all. It is the N. P. cases. What a multitude of agony is covered by these two letters of the alphabet. Column 1, fiscal year 1930, N. P. cases. They are neuropsychiatrics. They are the boys for whom there will never be an armistice. They are the boys in whom that little slender cord that binds the present to the past and the present to the future has been snapped away. It has been fractured and ruined by shell shock, by the detonation of 240-millimeter shells, and by all the living agony of war. How many have we got today?

Here they are: There are some 17,235. Yes. They are in the asylums. They are in the institutions of the country, and they look out rather vacuously as one talks to them, because there will be no end to the war for them. That is not the whole story, gentlemen. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs testified before the committee that it will be 1965 before we reach the peak of those whose minds will slither away as a result of the war that was fought 21 years ago. From 1918 to 1965! How long is it? Forty-seven years. Then we reach a load of 27,000 mental cases. Let all those who would like to put this country into war read these figures. They will get some better ideas of war and war's aftermath, and will not be so free with the English language as they rush into the newspapers seeking perhaps to create war psychosis and war hysteria in this country that will sooner or later develop into another shambles and carnage. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, I could not refrain from talking on these items today. I felt it was necessary. I like to do my little bit for the country. As a member of several patriotic organizations, I go in for adequate national defense; but I am not going to lose sight of the ball. I want to keep my eyes glued upon the objective, which is the objective of peace with all nations, so that we do not have to go through the brutal experience that the country has been going through since 1929 or 1930. Oh, it is easy to talk about Herbert Hoover and the market crash of 1929 as the cause of the depression which still besets us for the tenth year. Everybody knows that he had not anything to do with it.

It was simply the ultimate effect of economic forces that were set in motion by the World War. You cannot kill off 12,000,000 young men like me, who are producers and consumers; you cannot dip down into the social and economic fabric of the world and throw them over on the junk pile without there being a great consequent inrush of forces that, for want of anything else, we dub by the term "depression." Yes, there is a law of retribution and a law of compensation, and when it breaks, oh, we set about in our feeble way to set up economic contrivances to head it off. But what we live through today is the result of man's own lack of vision, his short-sightedness, that cost so many millions of lives, including the lives of many from our own country. So when

you read these hearings, gentlemen, when you read about the Veterans' Administration, about the American Battle Monuments Commission, about the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics that is experimenting in the field of aerodynamics, think in terms of what may happen to those who make up this country if we are ever dragged into another struggle.

So with that much I am going to leave that item.

Now, I want to go to something else, a very prosaic item, the Central Statistical Board. It is not very important in itself, I suppose, because it carries only \$126,000, and the life of that Board expires this year. But you know as you sit there plying questions to those who come before the committee you find out how many returns, how many forms, how many questionnaires and reports must be filed by the citizenry of this country. We have appreciated this trouble before, so the Central Statistical Board was set up to coordinate the activities of governmental agencies in the field of statistics and reduce the number. It has functioned nearly 5 years.

They have gotten out a report in response to the request of the President of the United States. This report came out on the 10th day of January 1939. It is not very old. But if you will go through it, this is what you will find: Under administrative returns—and by "returns" I mean the return that has to be filed by the retail store with the Department of Commerce, the income-tax blank, the return that has to be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission by the railroads and many others—under "administrative returns" there were 97,500,000 filed last year. Think of it! Ninety-seven and one-half million returns, and the number of questions in those returns averaged 60. My conscience! We are making a nation of bookkeepers out of our people and keeping them so busy answering questions from Government institutions and agencies that a lot of them scarcely have time to make a living.

Here is the Internal Revenue Bureau, 16,800,000 returns. United States Employment Service, 11,500,000. Over 30,000,000 in Social Security. Over ten and one-half million of regulatory returns; 17,000,000 farm returns. Can you not imagine a farmer out in that Illinois Corn Belt watching the mail carrier come along, scratching his head and saying, "Well, here comes another one of those infernal questionnaires, I suppose, from the Department of Agriculture or some other Federal agency, who wants to know how many bees we have on the place, how many goats, and how many chickens." The farmers are filing an average of three returns a year. There are over 21,000,000 farms that will file them. These are compiled by the Central Statistical Board.

Railroads! Have you any idea that the railroads have to file on the average of 1,000 returns annually with the Federal Government in all forms and branches? Large industries have to file at least 250 every year, and the small retailer has to file at least 10 which average 50 questions to the return. Well, I thought that the Central Statistical Board was going to stop some of that tomfoolery and nonsense, but instead I think it is going to get worse; and while I am going to make no move to strike that item out of this bill, I am not going to shed any tears if somebody else does, because I do not think that this Board is the answer. Tons and tons and tons of literature infiltrate into the Government every year in the form of questions and questionnaires and returns. It is a tremendous thing.

A businessman told me no later than this morning that he received a questionnaire that will take his firm at least 3 months to complete and it is likely to cost \$15,000 to provide the answers for it. You cannot laugh this sort of thing off. It has become a tremendous and onerous burden on business and industry. Congress will have to make a determined effort to see that this burden is diminished somewhat. There is no other answer for it, and the sooner we start the better. Now, do not forget, we have this responsibility. Some 38,000,000 of these returns come in because in the laws that went across this floor we wrote provisions requiring that returns be made, and in all other respects these returns are incidental to the functions with which we have invested so



many governmental agencies today. Take heed, then, when other legislation comes into this Chamber, as to whether or not we can do a little something to lift this tremendous statistical burden off the back of American business and American industry. Statistics are necessary, but we have so much duplication and unnecessary falderol today that it just adds to the Nation's bewilderment; and do not forget that the more statistics we require the more jobs and the greater the expense.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a little about the T. V. A., because it has been discussed here rather freely this afternoon. I never think of T. V. A. but what I think of Aaron Burr and his old side-kick, Blennerhassett. You remember away back—John, was it not 1804? I think it was.

Mr. RANKIN. Is the gentleman referring to Aaron Burr now or Samuel Insull? I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. You know, my old friend from Mississippi will always drag a red, white, and blue herring across the trail. It was down in his country that Aaron Burr and Blennerhassett sought to set up an inland empire, oh, I expect 130 or 140 years ago. They were going to include all that southwestern country and even include Mexico; but it was a rather abortive and fruitless attempt, and did not get very far. They sought by force of arms to set up an inland empire. Congress, however, has gone them one better. We set one up by legislation in 1933, and we called it the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not now. I am afraid of those red, white, and blue herrings the gentleman has up his sleeve.

It is an empire; make no mistake about it. It owns 500,000 acres of land. It has a 10-dam construction program on down there, and there are going to be more dams; make no mistake about that, either. There was some speculation a little while ago as to whether that was contemplated in the original program. It does not make any difference whether it was or not; their authority is sufficiently broad if other dams are necessary; they can build them on the Holston River, on the Little Tennessee, on the Clinch, on the French Broad River. These rivers, according to Mr. Parker, the chief engineer, tail out away up in the hills of Tennessee so small that you can step across them, but they are thinking some of making those places navigable. Well, I sometimes think it would be better to pave them and make highways out of them, because I expect there will be but very little navigation up there.

It has become a colossal program, however, not only from the standpoint of power but from the standpoint of expenditure. It is going to involve at least \$494,000,000 according to their own testimony, but in our considered judgment it will run over \$500,000,000. Remember also they own 500,000 acres of land, and this is going to be important also from what they call their related activities; and these, Mr. Chairman, are very interesting. I know of nothing in which the Tennessee Valley Authority is not interested at the present time, and that includes fertilizer. I think you have heard a good deal about it.

I have heard a great deal about the broad authority for producing fertilizer down there, but I rather fancy if you go back to the original act of 1933 you will find that the original purpose was to produce nitrogen by a fixation process—and it is so stated in the act. To be sure, they had extra authority, and I do not quarrel about that; but I am directing your attention to the fact that they are getting just a little bit wide of the mark down there; and when they talk about their phosphate fertilizer program and their acquisition of land at \$2,000 per acre, I scratch my head a little bit and commence to wonder whether all this was within the purview of the original act. You will find in the hearings that last year their manufacturing expense on large-scale production of fertilizer was \$1,875,000. Just bear that in mind. Let us say in round figures that the amount was \$1,800,000 for large-scale fertilizer operations. They sold this fertilizer in various places. How much did they get for it? They testified

before the committee that they got prices in line with the commercial price that obtained at that time.

How much did they get? They got \$1,250,000 and it cost \$1,800,000 to make it up. They got \$1,250,000.

I am disposed to question that kind of a function on the part of this Government because it goes far beyond the range of experimentation.

There is an item in here for \$450,000 for small-scale production and small-scale research. That is a fair amount of money. Out in my country, I remember my mother used to give me a penny on Sunday and said, "My son, do not spend it all in one place." It gave me some regard for a dollar and I tell you \$450,000 is a lot of money. So I am disposed to look into that a little bit. When I related before that the T. V. A. has spent over \$7,000,000 on the fertilizer program, not counting the investment cost, someone said, "Well, that is not very much." Mr. Chairman, that is a lot of money to me. I am disposed to look into that and see where commercial production ends and experimentation begins. If we are going to put them in the fertilizer business, let us go the whole darned hog and give them all the money they want. Let us go the whole hog and set them up as competitors of private enterprise in the country. But if you want to limit it to experiments and research in the development of an efficient fertilizer and an efficient process that can be administered and operated by private enterprise, then it seems to me this fertilizer program is going to bear a little investigation and a little bit of research. I had the impression back in 1933 that the T. V. A. would carry on fertilizer research and enable private industry to produce high-grade active fertilizers at a minimum cost. Today we find T. V. A. up to its neck in large-scale efforts and the end is not yet.

Let us look at some of the related items that the Tennessee Valley Authority is carrying on at the present time.

Tree planting and erosion control. They own their own nurseries down there. They are going to set out 9,000,000 trees in 1940. They set out 20,000,000 trees in 1938. I am wondering whether we set them up for that purpose or whether the States of Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, and the other States ought to carry on that kind of a function? That is just one item. For that, of course, they are asking only \$93,000 this year.

Fish and game preservation. I do not assume to know whether it is a fact, but certainly it was disclosed to me that in the course of their so-called malarial and mosquito control they poured poison on the waters and killed some of the fish and fish spawn. Now we have to bring the fish back and we have \$117,000 in here for fish and game preservation.

Land use and recreational planning. What fine language. Recreational possibilities of Gilbertsville and Watts bar reservoirs. Land use and recreational operations and development for 1940—\$49,000.

Readjustment of families and completed projects. It is a very naive statement. Remember, this is the Tennessee Valley's language, not mine. They say that many of the families have settled close to their former homes, which has occasioned some pressure on the available land resources, and because these folks insist on coming back home we have got to have a program to adjust them, so we are going to spend \$44,000 on that.

Planning studies of villages. Why, bless you, every village they are operating down there is operating at a loss. Let us consider the Muscle Shoals Village operation. Look at this fine language. You would miss it unless you were an accountant. "Estimated net income and expense, fiscal year 1940." If you just casually read that it would not mean so much, but when you ask a question or two, do you know what you find? You will find, in addition to the rent they collected down in the Muscle Shoals Village they still have to have \$126,000 out of the Federal Treasury to make it pay. What kind of a fool management is it which cannot rent houses down there and make the village a going self-sustaining concern?

Here is the Norristown operation. The same thing obtains. The sum of \$73,000 has to be taken out of the Federal Treasury to make it pay.

Maintenance of national-defense properties. That is one that makes me a bit hot. When this bill came on in 1933 for consideration I remember the great, tall, and stentorian discussion about preserving those plants down there in the event of an emergency. I refer to that old nitrate plant down there. I doubt whether you could get the wheels to turn over and if you will ask one of the engineers he will tell you that that kind of an operation will be obsolete if an emergency ever arises. But, Mr. Chairman, we keep it going, and we dip into the Treasury to the tune of \$80,000 a year in order to do it.

I will just mention some of these related activities:

General mapping, \$316,000. My God, what a lot of maps you could make for \$316,000.

General studies and surveys: What that language means the Lord only knows, but the language is going to cost us \$97,000.

Forest redevelopment and soil conservation, \$291,000.

Agricultural development and soil conservation, \$262,000; and under that there are some beautiful things. For instance, dehydration of fruits and vegetables. They squeeze a little water out of the sweetpotatoes down there so they will get to market fresher. Freezing of fruits and vegetables. They freeze young berries, strawberries, peaches, and that sort of thing. They froze several thousand pounds and got them up to the St. Louis market last year. I understand it cost 27 cents a pound to get them up there and they were sold for 7 cents a pound. I suppose that is all right in the great and good name of experimentation, but it is costing like sin and it is coming out of the Federal Treasury.

Transportation studies: Tell me by what authority the T. V. A. is making transportation studies? Oh, they got out a book this year. It has a great title, "The Interterritorial Freight Rate Problem of the United States."

I do not know where they get that authority, but they are getting money out of the Federal Treasury to conduct a study of that kind, and it is living proof of what I said a while ago to the effect that it is an empire unto itself that combines every function now exercised by this Government. Soon we shall be able to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, the State governments of the seven States in the T. V. A. area, and let T. V. A. march on.

You can understand now when I say here is a great inland empire, freezing strawberries, inventing electric hay dryers, planting trees, generating electricity, and spewing concrete over 500,000 acres, and do you not believe it is about time we look into it?

The investigating committee empowered by this House and by the Senate was down there, and after they left Knoxville what happened? Oh, the Tennessee Valley Authority authorized an audit of its books. Do you know that the General Accounting Office has not audited a lot of the things down there since 1934? You will find that in this book. Then they hired Lybrand, Ross Bros. & Montgomery, an outstanding firm of accountants, and paid them \$40,000 of Tennessee Valley money—yes; but taxpayers' money—to audit the books after the investigating committee had left Knoxville.

They have a big item in here for legal expense. They have lots of lawyers on the pay roll, make no mistake about it. You will find on the last page of this justification, "Legal department, for 1939, \$240,000." But that is not enough; they must have other lawyers. You will not find it here or in their annual report, but they went up to New York and got John Lord O'Brien, who once ran against Senator WAGNER, and paid him \$75,000 for legal services in connection with recent litigation. In the light of this expenditure it is a little amusing to think how the President inveighed against lawyers a year or two ago as economic royalists. But, royalists or not, they look good to T. V. A. when it gets into trouble.

This sort of thing is going to bear a little investigation, and we are going to have to keep our eyes open because they are playing with \$500,000,000 of the people's money, and it is, in

part, money derived from my constituents and the constituents of every other Member of this House. The direct appropriation of \$39,000,000 will come out of the pockets of the taxpayers in all sections of the country, and if most of them get any benefits, they will be so tenuous and slender as to be virtually invisible.

I am going to make it my business to see whether or not there is an efficient expenditure of that sum, even though the whole program in this inland empire may be justified from the point of flood control, power, and navigation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. In connection with the gentleman's remark about flood control I should just like to inform the gentleman that the mayor of Paducah, Ky., the largest city in western Kentucky, called me at midnight last night and told me they had turned loose a 17-foot head of water down that river without notice to anyone, and that it had swept away barges and lumberyards and one thing and another. I suppose that is the kind of flood control they are going to give us from now on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My good friend the gentleman from Kentucky knows we thrashed that question out here. We licked the Gilbertsville Dam three times on this floor, but a provision for its construction was placed in the bill on the other side of the Capitol. It caught us in an unguarded moment, and it stayed in the bill. I should think the great Senator from Kentucky who is now in the Senate for another 6 years will not need this \$112,000,000 Gilbertsville Dam, this great, monumental mass of masonry which is supposed to be for power and flood control, and should now assist in making a saving for the Nation's taxpayers. No engineer has yet justified it to me. In my experience in hydraulics and as a dredging contractor out on that old Illinois River I have always learned that you had to have an empty dam in order to have effective flood control, but here we are going to have a full dam for power, and I suppose the upper 2 feet of the dam for flood control, and let the Tennessee River "go Gallagher" when it will.

You are not going to get much benefit down there, Andy, out of that Gilbertsville Dam, and it is going to cost us \$112,000,000. My regret, of course, is that it is going to cost my people a proportionate part of that sum. So, when you come to that part of the bill, think it over a little bit and determine whether or not we ought to call a halt. This dam is not needed for power. There is lots of power right now; enough to meet most of the demand. We ought to have a real, forthright investigation by the best engineers in the country. We can afford to spend \$1,000,000 if it is going to save \$112,000,000, and make no mistake about that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What about the investigation that has already been authorized? Does not the gentleman believe the findings of the committee making that investigation are of some significance, particularly in view of the glee with which the investigation was inaugurated by those who thought it would prove bad for the T. V. A.?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend the gentleman from California is just too naive. All the gentleman has to do is to look at the names of those who are on the committee and who predominate on the committee. If they had given us a committee of independent people who would not be beholden, say, to an administration or to any political group of any kind, we would really "go to town" on an investigation and get somewhere; but you cannot get anywhere if you start out with the premise that the purpose is not to uncover any pay dirt in the first instance, and then load the committee with enough members of one party so that the minority cannot go to the bottom of the matter.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman explain what the T. V. A. paid for phosphate lands down there and what the cost was?



Mr. DIRKSEN. The figures are in this justification. The T. V. A. bought 349 acres and paid for them \$678,000. They bought the land from the International Agricultural Corporation. There is testimony here also to show that the Victor Chemical Co. bought land, and how much did they pay? They paid \$75—not \$2,000—an acre.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the gentleman will permit, I simply wish to add that the record indicates the International Agricultural Corporation paid \$145,000 for the land to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is correct. That was \$145,000 for 2,348 acres. The representatives of the T. V. A. said, "Oh, there is a reason for it. The phosphate content of the land we bought is infinitely higher than that of the other and is more accessible and more available. It is easier to mine this phosphate, and so forth." Maybe that is so, Mr. Chairman, but it has to be powerfully good land, even with phosphate in it, to bring \$2,000 an acre; make no mistake about that.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman understand that representatives of J. P. Morgan & Co. control the chemical company that sold out to the T. V. A.?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not heard it, but it is possible.

Mr. TABER. It was in the papers around Knoxville.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is my benediction on T. V. A., and now I want to get to something else. I want to get to the Federal Communications Commission, sometimes referred to as the Federal Radio Commission. It used to be the Federal Radio Commission, but it is more inclusive now since the act of 1934.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If the time is to be divided equally, there are only 7 minutes remaining under the control of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois sufficient time to make up the 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 15 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Away back in 1910 we put the first radio act on the books, and there have been 36 or 37 enactments since that time, notably the act of 1934, which is known as the Communications Act. They have virtual life and death power over broadcasting in this country. As the thing had finally grown up, you know from your own experience on your own radio that there are about 90 available air pathways in the broadcast band and you get reception between 550 and 1500 kilocycles. It is the business of the Federal Communications to police the air. It must take over 700 broadcast stations and make them function in these pathways with little or no interference. It must issue licenses on the basis of public convenience and necessity. It issues licenses for a 6-month period and then requires renewals. Millions of dollars are invested in the radio industry, and that huge investment hangs on the hair of a license issued by a Federal commission. You can, therefore, appreciate the power and authority of the Commission and what it means to the industry. But more than that, there are 33,000,000 radio sets in this country, serving 27,000,000 homes, from which you can imagine how influential radio can be in influencing the lives, actions, and conduct of the people of this country. If any strange and mysterious things are happening in the Commission, I am sure that the American people and the radio industry want to know about it.

Now, there is a division in the Federal Communications Commission that looks after broadcasting. Over a period of years they have licensed about 714 stations, and I think there are 40 or 45 more that will be under construction sometime this year.

Things have not been so well down there for one reason or another. My colleague from Massachusetts indicated to the committee yesterday that as early as December there was

an editorial in Business Week saying that Tom Corcoran was writing a new radio act. This was long before we came here for the Seventy-sixth Congress. Then on the 7th of December the Washington Post carried an article on the front page to the effect that they had heard Mr. Corcoran was writing a new radio act.

We asked Mr. McNinch about it in the committee, and you will find the colloquy in the hearings. He says he knew nothing about it; and then as we plied him with questions about why the Board of Examiners was dismissed, why it was abolished, in fact, and why the full hearing procedure was changed, he looked at the chairman in considerable dismay, and finally said:

Mr. Chairman, before I make any statement I want to say I do not think it is within the province of the Appropriations Committee to ask for this information coming along with a justification on a Budget item.

But he said:

If I have got to testify, the first thing I want to say to you is that the President sent a message up to Senator WHEELER and Chairman LEA, and he is going to ask for a reorganization of the Radio Commission.

What is this reorganization, and what is wrong down there? Well, I do not know. I am not going to speak from hearsay, and I am not going to do anybody down there an injustice; but the dismissal of experienced and trusted employees, the complete revamping of the examining procedure, the effort of Chairman McNinch to secure exception from the civil-service rules of 40 attorneys in the Commission, the quick rush of the Chairman of the Commission to the air waves to defend this action when the news broke in the press, the feeble and unconvincing justification of this whole action, and the speedy effort to invoke an investigation of radio monopoly by the Commission itself when it heard that Congress was contemplating such action are enough to justify the conclusion that all is not right. I am a little alarmed about it for the simple reason if they do send a message and they do ask for a three-man commission by new legislation, instead of a seven-man commission, I am wondering how far the administration is going to go to dominate that Commission; and if you ever dominate the airways and give anybody absolute control, you have got control of the United States of America—make no mistake about it.

There is a provision in this Radio Act that I do not like. I suspect I voted for it in 1934, not knowing, perhaps, what I was voting for at the time, because the matter had not gone to the degree that it has now; but if you ever examine that act and look at section 606, here is what it says:

606. (c) Upon proclamation by the President that there exists war or a threat of war or a state of public peril or disaster or other national emergency, or in order to preserve the neutrality of the United States, the President may suspend or amend for such time as he sees fit the rules and regulations applicable to any or all stations within the jurisdiction of the United States.

I am alluding to that this afternoon because that bill probably will be on the floor one of these days if it is ever reported out of the committee. Then we will have a chance to ventilate our views and determine whether or not we want a small commission that can be dominated, that may probably invoke censorship, that may probably keep people off the airways, that can determine how far you can go without comment and political commentary, or whether we are to have an independent commission, sufficient in size to guarantee and to assure to the people of this country that there is going to be no domination of the air channels. If I had it to do over again, I would never vote for that proposition, and I am not sure but what I shall drop a bill into the hopper one of these days to repeal in whole or in part section 606, paragraph (c), because I would not like to see a situation such as prevailed only last week in the National Capital be made the vehicle for dominating the airways and controlling the things that might be said to the people of the country.

I do not know why Mr. McNinch was sent to the Radio Commission. I do not know why he abolished the examiners, but there is now in effect an examining procedure down there that in my humble judgment is not as good or as efficient or

as sound as the procedure in vogue before that change was made. It may be that it is all part and parcel of an effort to streamline this Commission, because of its importance in purveying sentiment and truth to the people everywhere in the country.

This offers a good opportunity to make an observation on this and other commissions. The trouble is not in the law; it is not necessarily a great basic weakness in the radio law as such, but rather in the personnel. When you go back you will find that most of our troubles heretofore have been because of those who sat on the board, who probably have not administered the act as it should have been administered. They removed Mr. Humphrey from the Federal Trade Commission back in 1935. I thought he was a good man, and he should have stayed there, because he gave quite an efficient administration. Then there was the trouble and difficulty in the Tennessee Valley Authority when Mr. Arthur Morgan was removed. Now we have a situation in that a former Member of the House is before the Senate for confirmation of appointment to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and we have this same personal problem on the part of the Federal Communications Commission. I am not advising the President as to what he ought to do, but I do say that a lot of these things and a lot of friction could have been eliminated if perhaps just a little more care had been exercised in getting administrators and key men who will administer and carry out the law that the people's representatives have enacted, without fear or favor, and without making an attempt to control an important agency of government. Instead of abolishing the examining procedure of the Commission, the Chairman might have given some time to the formulation of a radio policy which we do not have today, and to other basic needs that are so essential to the industry and to the public. Back in Civil War days someone remarked, "Let me write the songs of a nation and I care not who makes the laws." That might today be paraphrased by saying, "Give me the control of the Nation's air waves, and I care not who makes its laws." This Congress must be on the alert when this matter comes on.

That leads me to the last item which I wish to discuss. That is the National Labor Relations Board. I do not want to say a great deal about it, except about one phase. I listened with interest to the colloquy that occurred this afternoon to the effect that we ought to strike the whole appropriation out of the bill. Gentlemen, you cannot do that. The Appropriations Committee has no such authority. We are simply agents and servants of the House.

Congress wrote that legislation known as the Wagner Act and set up the National Labor Relations Board. Having gotten it on the books, you virtually mandated the Committee on Appropriations to look over their Budget justifications and to determine by report how much money they ought to have to carry on their functions. If a change is to be made, it ought to be made by amending the law, not by striking out, not by cutting down the amount to such proportions that you hamstring or cripple or decapitate the functions of the National Labor Relations Board. I have some different opinions about it. The Wagner Act is on the books, and if we will be honest with ourselves, we know that it is there to stay. It is a case now of efficiency, and shall I say tactful administration, but in that respect there has been some difficulty probably in a lack of tact, a lack of diplomacy on the part of some of the members of the Board. I shall give you an illustration of it. I hold no personal animus toward any member of the Board. I asked Mr. Edwin Smith to put into the record his speech delivered in Mexico to the International Industrial Relations Institute on September 3, 1938. I thought it was proper that he should do so. There was considerable talk about that speech, and I asked him to put it into the record. I suggest that you read it. You can understand why the Labor Board has not always fared as well in the press and in the eyes of the public as it might have. Remember that these gentlemen hold judicial authority. They exercise quasi legislative and executive functions, as well as judicial functions, and when they appear before the public they ought to be rather careful about their

language. Board members cannot make intemperate public statements on a highly controversial law and then expect to secure maximum cooperation from the affected parties and from the public.

Here is what Edmund Smith said, among other things—and you will find it on page 1643 of the hearings. He said:

One cannot temporize with the wording of a statute for reasons of diplomacy.

If he had been a little more diplomatic there would not be the hostility today that there is, and the chances are that this act might have been administered with far less friction than you find right now between employers and employees.

But that expression of administrative philosophy is the key to the demand for modifications of the Wagner Act today and to the lack of confidence on the part of many in securing proper administration from some members of the Board. By contrast, it is interesting to compare the approach of the Federal Trade Commission. To that agency we entrusted the administration of the Robinson-Patman Act. The Federal Trade Commission could have disrupted the entire distribution structure of the country had it been so disposed. Instead, it took a calm judicial view of the matter and has been able to proceed with administration and enforcement of the act, and without temporizing, and yet avoiding the frictions and heat that are so often destructive of genuine and enduring progress.

That is No. 1. But let me read another one that I thought was essentially unfair. I can understand how a man gets into the ill grace of the people by making statements of this kind. On page 1640, reading from this Mexican speech, he said:

The enemies of the act at first pinned their hopes on the expectation that the Supreme Court would declare the act unconstitutional. The judges in many of our lower Federal courts shared this expectation.

Who is he, as an administrative officer of the Government, to make a blanket indictment against the Federal courts when that Board has to appear in those same courts? You talk about lack of tact. Yes. That is lack of tact, and it is not any wonder they have gotten into difficulty. I never heard Chairman Warren Madden say that sort of thing. I think the Chairman of the Labor Board has done a pretty fair job. Not so long ago you heard him over the radio in debate with Charles Hook, of the American Rolling Mill Co. He gave a good account of himself. He made a calm, factual exposition of his case without using strictures against employers or employees. If all the members of the Board had done likewise a great deal of the heat, a great deal of the vehemence with which this Board is assailed would not be in evidence today. But if Mr. Edwin Smith made that kind of a speech in public it is only to be inferred that he may have uttered similar sentiments elsewhere. So I can readily understand, through the lack of tact and the lack of diplomacy, that this act has given so much trouble. Is it any wonder that the American Federation of Labor wants it amended? Is it any wonder that employers want it amended? It is because they are afraid of expressions of that kind, and do not know where it will ultimately lead.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman aware that this Board about which he is talking has ruled officially that a manufacturer or employer cannot give to his workers the speech of a Congressman?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Perhaps so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is not any question about it. They have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not justify everything the Board has done. I recognize they are an exploratory body. They have been feeling their way, but I do say that a lot of the ill will of the country has been rightfully incurred because of tactless statements like that.

Here is another one, in connection with sit-down strikes. At page 1629 of the hearings Mr. Madden said:

My own attitude certainly is that the sit-down is an illegal trespass upon the employer's property.



Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me finish. We asked Mr. Donald Smith that question. He said:

I do not condone sit-down strikes, and may I say that I hold the same views as does the chairman with regard to the sit-down strike situation.

We asked Mr. Edwin Smith that question, and he said:

I suppose that the legality of the sit-down strike, as the chairman suggested, is not a matter for determination by the Board, but by the courts. I am aware of the fact that in a number of jurisdictions laws have been passed since the sit-down was instituted as a weapon of striking, which have defined them as trespasses or misdemeanors, or otherwise illegal.

Then he said:

I think that the sit-down strike is a pretty flexible term.

Well, you read your own interpretation into it; but is it any wonder that they are shooting at the Board today? Why did he not make an out-and-out statement and say, "It is illegal; it has been so held and as an administrative officer of the Government we say it is an illegal act and a trespass upon the rights of the employer"? But no; he had to equivocate. He had to go around the corner. That is the reason that the Labor Board has been in difficulty, because of that sort of thing. I like to defend them when I can, because I think they have done a lot of good work, but I want to recur to the premise I made a little while ago in connection with the Federal Communications Commission. So often the trouble is not in the act; it is in the maladministration of the act and in tactless statements made in public. We probably can, with profit, amend the Wagner Act, but it probably would not have all the heat and curse that is on it today if there had been a little more tact and a little more forthrightness on the part of some who have the authority to administer it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said here about the appropriation for the Gilbertsville Dam. During the few minutes I have at my disposal I want to hold myself to a discussion of the appropriation for the Gilbertsville Dam. I want to cite you some of the findings of fact that have been made in the various court proceedings and some of the statements that have been made by the leading engineers of this country relative to the importance of Gilbertsville Dam and the construction of a high dam.

#### STATEMENT ON GILBERTSVILLE DAM

Gilbertsville Dam is the key dam in the T. V. A. system for the improvement of navigation on the Tennessee River and the control of floods on the Tennessee and Mississippi Rivers. Five years of research and investigation have gone into the planning of this dam. It is one of the most valuable and urgently necessary water-control projects in the country. In an attempt to defeat an initial appropriation for this dam a number of arguments have been made plausible to the layman but without any foundation in fact. There is summarized below the facts with respect to the arguments against the construction of the dam, together with a summary of the reasons why failure to appropriate at this time for the beginning of construction of the dam would result in a grave set-back for the movement to conserve our natural resources, to control and improve our rivers, and to prevent flood devastation in the Tennessee and Mississippi River Basins. The facts stated are for the most part taken from official sources.

#### A. ANSWERS TO ARGUMENTS AGAINST CONSTRUCTION OF THE DAM

Low dams versus high dams: In the debates on the Gilbertsville appropriation, the statement has been made that low navigation dams would afford a superior type of navigation to that which would be supplied by Gilbertsville. Even Maj. Rufus Putnam, chief expert for the 18 utility companies in the recent T. V. A. case at Chattanooga—Tennessee Electric Power Co. against T. V. A.—admitted that navigation improvement by high dams such as Gilbertsville affords a more

technically efficient navigation channel than the alternative type of improvement by low dams (T. E. P. transcript, p. 1928). (The record in the T. E. P. case had not been printed when these citations were made and transcript references are to the official typewritten transcript of the proceedings. References to the Ashwander case are to the printed record.) And in the Ashwander case at Birmingham, in which the late Judge Grubb decided against T. V. A., the court nevertheless found as a fact that high dams of the type of Gilbertsville were superior to low dams for navigation purposes (finding of fact No. 138, Ashwander record, pp. 1082, 1083). The three-judge court at Chattanooga made the same finding (finding of fact No. 54). (Finding of fact No. 54, made by the court in the T. E. P. case, after many weeks of hearing evidence from many witnesses for both sides who covered every phase of the problem, is so conclusive on the advantage of high over low dams for navigation purposes that it is attached to this memorandum in full text.) These findings were based not on the testimony of the Authority's witnesses alone but on the basis of the testimony of the utilities' witnesses and of the Army engineers as well. In the Ashwander case Gen. George B. Pillsbury, then Assistant Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, testified that "there is no question as to the superiority of high dams over low dams for purposes of navigation" (Ashwander record, pp. 753, 754). In the Chattanooga case, Col. Lewis Watkins, who supervised the preparation of historic House Document 328, which was presented to Congress in 1930 by the Army engineers, and is the bible for the Tennessee River development, a man more familiar with the Tennessee River and its problems than any other living man, testified that high dams were superior in every way to the low-dam type of development (T. E. P. transcript, pp. 3271-3274). In House Document 328 itself the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors made the flat assertion (p. 13) that a 9-foot waterway improvement by means of low-lift dams "would be inferior to the high-dam developments." The Gilbertsville Dam is one of the high-dam developments referred to.

Indeed, if low dams are built, it will be necessary in the future to destroy or submerge them in order to make way for high dams. In House Document No. 306, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, Gen. E. M. Markham recommended with respect to the Ohio "the progressive replacement of the old—low—locks and dams with a less number of higher-lift dams," and so forth. Low dams have no value for flood control or power, and waste the resources of the sites for these purposes (T. E. P. case, finding of facts Nos. 70, 93).

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. That is exactly the reason that the enemies of this legislation, who are in sympathy with the Power Trust, want to put in these low dams, to forever prevent your people from using the hydroelectric power in those streams.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And waste the resources.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to speak for a moment now about the use of the Gilbertsville pool by river craft.

Use of Gilbertsville pool by existing craft: Another argument made is that existing river craft will not be able to use the Gilbertsville pool. This is based on the bugaboo that the pool is so large that waves will be created by wind action which will interfere with the passage of the old type of river craft in use on the Ohio River. Colonel Watkins testified in the Chattanooga case that the contrary was true, that the crooked, winding channel created by low dams was much more hazardous to navigation than the large open channels created by the high dams. Mr. James Brodie, superintendent of maintenance and chief engineer of the Federal Barge Line of the Inland Waterways Corporation, a practical navigator of great experience, testified that "a deep, long, slack-water pool is much more easy to traverse and is much more dependable than any other kind of inland waterways" (T. E. P. transcript, p. 4895). Mr. Brodie also testified (T. E. P. transcript, pp. 4895-4896) that all of the equipment of the Federal Barge Line could be used on the Tennessee

River after completion of the high-dam system, and that all the craft in use on the Ohio and Mississippi could use these pools, except a few antiquated coal barges now in use on the upper Ohio, which would probably never have occasion to use the pools in any case.

We must not be misled by statements that the Gilbertsville Reservoir will be 5 miles wide. Such widths will occur only for several short stretches at the confluence points of a few large tributaries, and then only on the rare occasions when the pool is at top flood level. The width generally is less than 2 miles when the pool is at its normal navigation level.

Effect of flood draw-down on navigation pool: Another argument that has been made is that "the reservoir must be kept practically empty in order to catch floodwaters, and that would destroy navigation; with it dry and empty you could not navigate." This objection is wholly without foundation. At elevation 350—above sea level—the pool will have a minimum depth of 12 feet, adequate for vessels of 9-foot draft, with customary overdepths. From elevation 350 to the top of the gates, at elevation 375, there will be storage space for 4,600,000 acre-feet, which storage is all controlled flood storage and can be used for flood control without impinging in any way on the navigation pool.

Valley storage: A final argument against Gilbertsville is that it will displace natural "valley storage." The short answer to this argument was made in the T. E. P. case by Mr. George R. Clemens, civil engineer of the Mississippi River Commission, and in responsible charge of that Commission's Comprehensive Report on Reservoirs in the Mississippi River Basin (H. Doc. 259, 74th Cong., 1st sess.). He pointed out that valley storage was merely the successive positions taken by the flood itself, and that far from reducing floods on the Mississippi, this uncontrolled storage increased the flood heights on the Mississippi by retarding the discharge of the Tennessee until it coincided with the flood crest on the Mississippi, as occurred in the 1937 flood (T. E. P. transcript, pp. 3607-3611). The three-judge court came to the same conclusion (T. E. P. case, finding of fact No. 66).

#### B. FACTS IN SUPPORT OF IMMEDIATE CONSTRUCTION OF GILBERTSVILLE DAM

Strategic importance of Gilbertsville Dam for navigation: The Gilbertsville site is at the mouth of the Tennessee, near Paducah. It is therefore the bottle neck so far as the development of water commerce in the Tennessee Basin is concerned. No traffic can move in or out of the Tennessee Basin without passing through the 184-mile stretch which Gilbertsville Dam will improve. It is the great connecting link between the Tennessee Valley and the remainder of the great Mississippi Valley. The seven dams constructed or under construction on the Tennessee to provide 9-foot navigation will have only limited usefulness for through traffic between the Tennessee system and the Mississippi system unless this bottle neck is eliminated and a full standard channel created.

Strategic importance of Gilbertsville Dam for flood control on the lower Mississippi River: It is now universally recognized that it is absolutely necessary for Mississippi flood control to supplement the existing protection works on the Mississippi by reservoir projects on the tributaries. (See report of Army engineers of April 6, 1937, Committee Document No. 1, 75th Cong., 1st sess., pars. 20, 21.) The Gilbertsville site is the most strategic for this purpose in existence. It is immediately above the junction of the Ohio and the Mississippi at Cairo, and can therefore be regulated with precision, drawing down the pool in advance of floods and storing the entire flow of the Tennessee during the peak flood stages on the Mississippi, as the flood crest approaches Cairo. It is not only the most strategic reservoir in location, but the largest in size, and will alone cut off from 2 to 3 feet from the crest of the floods on the Mississippi from Cairo all the way down to Helena, Ark., with very substantial effect on flood heights through the remainder of the length of the Mississippi. When one recalls that the levees on the Mississippi have already been built to the maximum feasible height, and that in times of flood disaster even inches are important the tremendous benefits to Mississippi flood control from this project can be appreciated (T. E. P. case, findings of fact Nos. 61-63).

The Gilbertsville site is far cheaper for Mississippi flood control than any other site in the Mississippi Basin. A report on this site by a board of independent consulting engineers, consisting of Mr. O. N. Floyd, of Dallas, Tex., consultant for the Army engineers on the flood-control project at Sardis, Miss., and numerous other projects; Mr. L. L. Hiding, an experienced consulting engineer associated with Mr. A. E. Morgan in the design and construction of numerous flood-control projects; and Mr. E. W. Lane, for a number of years associated with the Bureau of Reclamation and now professor of hydraulic engineering at Iowa State University, contains the following conclusion:

The cost of the Gilbertsville project per acre-foot of storage or per foot of reduction in flood stage at Cairo, Ill., is less than one-half the cost of any other reservoir or system of reservoirs which could be located on the tributaries of the Mississippi River above Cairo.

The three-judge court at Chattanooga, in its unanimous opinion last year, made the following statement:

It is reasonably estimated that Gilbertsville, when completed, will supply over 4,000,000 acre-feet of flood storage, and it is the most important of the series for flood control on the Ohio and Mississippi.

Even the conservative Engineering News-Record, which is opposed to the Authority's power activities, editorially recognized the outstanding character of this project in its issue of April 7, 1938. The editorial is attached in full text.

Effect of delay on program of T. V. A.: Any delay in the construction of this project creates the hazard that the delay will result in loss of life and destruction of property because of a flood catastrophe which this project could have averted. Delay in construction postpones the removal of the bottle neck to through navigation on the Tennessee River and the full realization of the benefits of the Tennessee Valley Authority project.

Delay would be wasteful as well as dangerous. The Authority has planned its construction program to achieve maximum economy and efficiency. It has prepared long-range plans for the transfer of men and equipment from project to project in a coordinated series. Indeed, all of the dams have been treated as a single giant project. An interruption in the construction of any single unit of this great project will impair economy and efficiency and result in the waste both of human resources and of material.

If the appropriation is not made now, it will be necessary for the Authority to discharge scores of experienced engineers. These men have acquired invaluable experience in dealing with this project in its preliminary phases. If these men are discharged, they can never be reassembled, and replacements will have to be made from less qualified and experienced personnel. Gilbertsville is not an emergency project, but a part of a permanent program for the conservation and utilization of our natural resources for the benefit of the people of America. However, the necessity of stimulating employment in the current business recession adds final force to the argument for constructing the project at this time.

Gilbertsville is a part of a regional project. However, its greatest value is not for the Tennessee Basin but for the whole Mississippi Valley below Cairo. It is a truly national project. [Applause.]

TEXT OF FINDING OF FACT NO. 54 MADE BY THREE-JUDGE COURT IN TENNESSEE ELECTRIC POWER CO. ET AL. V. TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ET AL.

54. The high-dam projects of the Authority will provide a navigation improvement substantially superior to that which could be provided by the system of low dams set forth in House Document No. 328. The superiority of high dams for navigation was recognized by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in House Document No. 328. The Authority's projects will provide superior channel depths and widths, substantially fewer lockages, substantially less current velocities, pool fluctuations, and interruptions from floods. The elimination of lockages will substantially reduce the time consumed in lockages; the superiority of channel depths and reduction of current velocities will substantially increase the speed of movement and reduce the amount of motive power required; and the wider and longer pools of the high dams are preferred by the navigator to the narrow, crooked pools of the low dams. The reduction in pool fluctuations will greatly encourage the development of terminal facilities necessary to the development



of commercial navigation. The advantages of the Authority's projects in these respects will insure a substantially greater efficiency of the navigation channel, substantially greater dependability of service, and may reasonably be expected to attract a substantially greater volume of traffic on the improved river. The high dams will also provide substantial improvement of navigation on the tributaries which would not be provided by the low-dam projects. The advantages of high dams cannot be accurately measured in monetary terms. The boats and barges which are now in general use on the interconnected inland waterways of the Mississippi River system will be able to navigate the Tennessee River where improved by the projects of the Authority without change of design or extent of loading.

[Editorial from the Engineering News-Record of April 7, 1938]

#### BASIC CONTROL

Current animosities may easily inspire the thought that no more money should be squandered on T. V. A. expansion, and that therefore the plan to build a large dam at the mouth of the Tennessee River should be rejected. Such a thought would be unfair. It would ignore the fact that the Gilbertsville project mainly serves to reduce Mississippi River floods. Of course, the big reservoir would also improve navigation on the Mississippi, as well as open up the Tennessee itself; but the flood-control effect remains the commanding argument. Back of this situation lies a simple but compelling reason. The truth is that the whole Mississippi River control plan is a failure insofar as the city of Cairo and the basins immediately below are concerned; in last year's flood the city escaped destruction only by a hair. Gilbertsville would provide a safety margin by cutting 2 to 4 feet off Cairo flood heights—not enough in the biggest flood but a very considerable approach to full protection. It would be the first piece of effective tributary control, and one of the largest, in the ultimate Mississippi River system. The estimate of flood benefits reported by Carl A. Bock on another page, approaching \$100,000,000, reflects its importance and emphasizes that the project deserves earnest consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY

Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, including the expenses of operation, maintenance, and upkeep of air navigation facilities, in carrying out the duties, powers, and functions devolving upon it pursuant to the authority contained in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 973), including traveling expenses and expenses of employees detailed by the Chairman of the Authority or the Administrator to attend meetings of associations, organizations, or other properly constituted bodies concerned with the civil aeronautics industry or the art of aeronautics, in the United States or in foreign countries; personal services and rentals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field, including actual expenses of subsistence or per diem allowance in lieu thereof; expenses of packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of household effects and other personal property (not exceeding in any one case 5,000 pounds) of employees when transferred from one official station to another for permanent duty, upon specific authorization by the Chairman of the Authority or the Administrator; purchase and exchange of professional and scientific books, law books, books of reference, atlases and maps, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase and exchange (not to exceed \$400,000), operation, maintenance, repair, and overhaul of aircraft, aircraft power plants, propellers and equipment, and spare parts thereof; purchase and exchange (not to exceed \$45,000), hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles, including two automobiles for use in the District of Columbia; and purchase of special clothing, wearing apparel, and suitable equipment for aviation purposes (including rubber boots, snowshoes, and skis), \$13,738,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for payments, at a rate not to exceed 3 cents per mile, to maintenance and operating personnel, as reimbursement to such personnel of the expenses of necessary travel in their personally owned automobiles within the limits of their official posts of duty when such travel is performed in connection with the maintenance and operation of remotely controlled air navigation facilities.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 8, line 1, strike out "\$13,738,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$11,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the Civil Aeronautics Authority was created a year ago, and it was indicated to us that it would promote efficiency and economy to have this organization in this shape. The result of the proposition, however, is that so far we are presented with a 50-percent increase in the cost of operation next year over the cost for the current year. Frankly, this is not along the line of efficiency and economy, in my belief.

The cost of these functions at the present time is, altogether, \$14,000,000; that is, for the current fiscal year, 1939.

LXXXIV—77

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that last year when the civil aeronautics bill passed the House not one word was said, according to my recollection, by any Member on either side of the Chamber that it would be more economical to establish the Civil Aeronautics Authority. What we did say was that it would bring about more efficiency and a greater promotion of aeronautics in civilian life. I think the members who were on the committee at that time will bear me out in my statement.

Mr. TABER. I am rather surprised, Mr. Chairman, because I have always understood that the set-up was supposed to promote efficiency and economy.

This outfit went to the Budget and requested \$34,000,000. The Budget dropped them to \$21,230,000, and this committee has dropped them to \$21,218,000. What kind of set-up has this organization and what kind of set-up is it proposed to give them?

At the present time the number of employees upon this roll is 3,233. This is brought about with an appropriation this year of \$14,000,000. It is proposed to give them 4,332 employees in the fiscal year 1940—an increase of 1,100 employees. At the present time the Interstate Commerce Commission, with all its regulation of railroads, trucks, busses, and all that sort of thing, has a total of only 2,739 employees. It seems to me that it is absolutely ridiculous for this activity, even if it does to a certain extent engage in promotion, even if it does to a certain extent engage in the development of some airports—it seems to me that it is absolutely ridiculous for this organization to carry a set-up 50 percent greater than that of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As this House approaches the problem of the cost of government it must show a tendency to economize if we are to get anywhere. The amendment I have offered would cut this appropriation that appears on the top of page 8, for salaries and expenses, \$2,738,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. If this amendment is adopted, I propose to attempt to reduce the item on page 9, line 10, by \$1,000,000, thereby saving nearly \$4,000,000 out of this whole appropriation. It seems to me that if we are to get anywhere it is absolutely necessary to get rid of a large portion of these additional employees that are expected to be added.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment. If the gentleman will turn to page 1878 of the hearings, he will see where it is proposed to increase the number of regional employees from 2,489 to 3,620, and to increase their compensation by \$2,300,000. The entire set-up is on a basis of extravagance and tremendous overhead.

We can never get stability in this Government if we are continually to increase every item that comes up. I hope, therefore, that the House will take a position for economy and cut out the major portion of this increase in the number of employees and \$2,000,000 in salaries. They would not be necessary with efficient management. We can very well allow \$1,000,000 less for facilities and developmental expense.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does the gentleman know how much was carried in the bill last year for navigation facilities?

Mr. TABER. I can tell the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will supply the figure for him: \$4,570,000. This year they ask for \$15,312,870. I am asking the gentleman if, time after time, in the last few years here in Congress there has not been criticism because the Government did not establish air navigation facilities to protect the passengers and the planes?

Mr. TABER. The Government is going a very long way at this time in attempting to establish these facilities. It is moving faster than there is any reason for so doing.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I ask the gentleman if he knows how many men it takes to man one of these beacon lights at an air station?

Mr. TABER. Perhaps three.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It takes five, and the more you have the more men it is going to take. This acts as a protection to the planes and to the passengers in those planes. I am calling this to the gentleman's attention, because this was done for the absolute safety of the traveling public. The Congress should not stint when it comes to saving human lives.

Mr. TABER. It is not necessary for the Congress to go back on the proposition of saving human life. It should go ahead and provide what is necessary, but it should not go ahead and provide a lot more than is necessary.

The proposal I made to make a cut on additional facilities was not to prevent providing what is necessary by this year's appropriation. The proposal I make is to cut \$1,000,000 off of a \$7,000,000 appropriation, which the gentleman referred to, and which compares with an appropriation of \$4,000,000 for the current year. I do not think that is cutting down unnecessarily on facilities which take care of human life. I think it is showing common sense and an honest progress, instead of being wildly extravagant. That is what this kind of a proposition sets up.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, 15 minutes on one amendment is rather long. I want the gentleman to have sufficient time.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES. I call attention to the fact that on page 35 the total appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission, with its varied functions of regulation, including air, rail, and water, is only \$8,908,000. The gentleman's proposition is to reduce the appropriation in the case of one item for the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. TABER. It is to reduce this particular item to \$11,000,000, as that is an increase over the current year.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. Does the gentleman think that within 1 year of the operation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority they could develop the practical operation to a degree of consistency with the safety requirements of present-day flying? I feel that the gentleman's suggestion is good, but I think it is untimely. I think he is 2 years ahead of time. The Civil Aeronautics Authority does not have the necessary money to carry out its functions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. Chairman, the House, after great deliberative consideration passed a bill organizing the Civil Aeronautics Authority and did so because it felt there was a great and pressing need for a concentrated effort to operate in this new field of navigation which so vitally affects the lives of American people. Since that event we have been more impressed with the fact that aviation is facing an era of great

expansion. The people are using it more and more every day. Every time we pick up a newspaper we are confronted with a situation where there has been loss of life and property.

This agency estimated its needs, composed as it is of experts in their lines, at a total of \$34,895,000. The Budget cut that \$13,000,000, which was a severe and drastic cut. My good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], keen and astute as he is, did not hear the proceedings before the subcommittee. He has had access to the hearings. However, I believe every member of the subcommittee was impressed with the ability and the sincerity of the people who are operating this department. As far as I am concerned, I do not want to take the responsibility of impeding the development of this new agency, which is so vitally necessary in this time of expanded aviation.

I hope the Committee will allow these items, which have been passed upon by the subcommittee unanimously, so far as I know, and permit them to stand and give the Civil Aeronautics Authority a chance to organize and to operate satisfactorily in this important field.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Air Safety Board: For salaries and expenses of the Air Safety Board in carrying out the duties and functions devolving upon it pursuant to the provisions of title VII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 973), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses; contract stenographic reporting services; operation, maintenance, repair, and overhaul of aircraft; hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles, including one automobile for use in the District of Columbia; and purchase of special clothing, wearing apparel, and suitable equipment for aviation purposes (including rubber boots, snowshoes, and skis), \$380,000, of which amount not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for temporary employment in the investigation of aircraft accidents of consultants and experts on a contract or fee basis without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope every Member of the House now present will remember the words of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] a few moments ago when he spoke so highly of those in charge of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, because when we come to the consideration of page 66 it is my purpose to offer an amendment restoring the salaries that were provided by the last Congress in setting up the Civil Aeronautics Authority. It is true Congress after most careful consideration set up this very necessary agency as Mr. WOODRUM says.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations has reduced the salaries of these very outstanding men, about which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] just spoke, despite the fact the statutory provision states they shall be paid a certain salary. As I pointed out in my remarks just before adjournment this is not economy. You might limit the amount they can draw from this appropriation but if six unanimous decisions of the Court of Claims and Supreme Court mean anything everyone affected will eventually get their full salary with interest.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Missouri that one can think very highly of a Government administrator and still not give him the keys to the Federal Treasury. That is the answer.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Virginia was speaking about these experts, the wonderful men who are now running the Civil Aeronautics Authority, yet in another part of the bill he wants to cut the salaries of these experts. I only want to give them the salary that every Member of the House who voted for the Civil Aeronautics Authority bill in the last Congress provided they should receive. If we felt last year they should receive a specific salary then why limit the amount below that figure they can receive under this bill?

The proper way to approach this matter is through the legislative committee not by a limitation on an appropriation



bill. I hope Mr. WOODRUM will speak as highly tomorrow as he did today about the officials whose salaries he seeks to reduce.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

For three Commissioners and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including personal services required for examination of Presidential postmasters, and including not to exceed \$2,500 for employment of expert examiners not in the Federal service on special subjects for which examiners within the service are not available, and for personal services in the field; for medical examinations; for necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the Commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, including not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses incident to attendance at meetings concerned with problems of public officials, educational groups, Government employees as such, and other similar organizations, which are peculiar to the interests and business of the Commission, when specifically directed by the Commission; for furniture and other equipment and repairs thereto; rental of equipment; supplies; advertising; telegraph, telephone, and laundry service; freight and express charges; streetcar fares not to exceed \$300; stationery; purchase and exchange of law books, books of reference, directories, subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, not to exceed \$1,000; charts; purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of motortrucks, motorcycles, and bicycles; garage rent; postage stamps to prepay postage on matter addressed to Postal Union countries; special-delivery stamps; and other like miscellaneous necessary expenses not hereinbefore provided for, \$4,250,000, of which not to exceed \$550,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to expend not to exceed \$3,000 of this amount for actuarial services pertaining to the civil service, Canal Zone, and Alaska Railroad retirement and disability funds, to be obtained by contract, without obtaining competition, at such rates of compensation as the Commission may determine to be reasonable: *Provided further*, That no details from any executive department or independent establishment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere to the Commission's central office in Washington or to any of its district offices shall be made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, but this shall not affect the making of details for service as members of the boards of examiners outside the immediate offices of the district managers: *Provided further*, That the Civil Service Commission shall have power in case of emergency to transfer or detail any of its employees to or from its office or field force.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my approbation of the action of the Committee in giving the Civil Service Commission the amount recommended by the Budget in this year's annual appropriation. For many years the Civil Service Commission has been handicapped in performing its duties by the lack of a proper appropriation. While the amount appropriated in this bill is considerably less than the Commission asked of the Budget, the committee has given them every dollar the Budget recommended, as I recall the figures.

In this connection I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the Commission has stationed one of its staff in the office of the House Committee on the Civil Service, room 246, in the old House Office Building. He will be there from 9 until 3 every day and from 9 until 12 on Saturday for the purpose of being of service to the Members of the House and their secretaries in dealing with any matters you may have with reference to the civil service. Mr. Robert L. Bailey is the contact man they have stationed in that position. I have found him to be a very capable and a very affable gentleman. He is there for your service for the purpose of enabling you to give better service to your constituents on matters affecting the civil service.

I again wish to express my appreciation to the Committee for this appropriation. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing of the liability of the United States, created by the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes", approved May 22, 1920, and acts amendatory thereof (38 U. S. C. 11), \$86,329,000, which amount shall be placed to the credit of the "civil-service retirement and disability fund."

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been flying aircraft for a little longer than 10 years, and I believe I know something about aviation. I want the Members of Congress to know that we had safe aviation before we had officials sitting here in the Civil Aeronautics Authority office in Washington. Safety does not depend on an office in Washington. The Civil Aeronautics Authority is merely a regulatory body. It controls the lighting of the airways, the beams, markers, and so forth. The safety of air transportation and the safety of the passengers depends on the private companies and on the pilots of the planes and not on the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

My statement is merely to give credit to the men who pioneered in aviation.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALLEY DWELLING AUTHORITY

The unexpended balance on June 30, 1939, of the "Conversion of inhabited alleys fund," established pursuant to the provisions of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, together with all accretions during the fiscal year 1940 to said fund under the provisions of said act and of the United States Housing Act of 1937 shall be available until June 30, 1940, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of said District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask a question of the gentleman from Virginia.

Does the provision for the Alley Dwelling Authority contemplate that the Authority is going to wind up its affairs in the course of time, or is there a revolving fund the Authority uses?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is a revolving fund, and the Authority gets more money from the United States Housing Authority.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. They have to lay out their program so they use the same money over and over, and, as they reconstruct buildings or erect new buildings, they are compensated by careful management of their properties and the rent on such buildings. In other words, they are demonstrating that low-cost housing can be made self-supporting by careful management.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just wanted to bring out these facts because it seems to me the Authority is doing an excellent job and I wanted to comment on it.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all printing and binding for the Federal Power Commission, including engraving, lithographing, and photolithographing, \$85,000.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Chairman, the matter I desire to bring to the attention of the House at this time is a telegram which I will read and comment on for a moment. This telegram is dated yesterday and was sent from Lawrenceburg, Ind., to Hon. EUGENE B. CROWE, Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Ohio River reaches threatening stage here tomorrow morning. Had rain occurred above Cincinnati and below Big Sandy, it is likely 1937 would be repeated, or, if rains come, may still repeat. Cannot appropriation for levee be passed and the people assured that relief of the hazardous condition immediately started? The public is much aroused, wanting to send 100 or more telegrams to you today. What is the present situation?

LAWRENCEBURG LEVEE COMMITTEE,  
V. M. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Chairman.

At about this time 2 years ago, on January 21, 1937, the floodwaters of the Ohio River overflowed the levees at the city of Lawrenceburg, Ind., and at Jeffersonville, Ind., as well as other points along the Ohio River, and flooded some 11 States. Many millions of dollars' loss was sustained at Lawrenceburg, Aurora, Rising Sun, Patriot, Vevay, Madison,

Utica, Jeffersonville, Clarksville, and other points in my district. According to the figures of the War Department, more than \$400,000,000 of property was destroyed by that flood, although \$800,000,000 is the figure placed on the damage by many people who have taken a survey of the situation. More than 1,000,000 people were rendered homeless and were removed from their homes, many by train as the water was coming over the tracks and many by trucks and automobiles. They were taken out on rafts, in boats, motorboats, canoes, and what not. The suffering lasted for many days, for many weeks, and in cases many months. Thus you can understand the conditions and the mental feeling of everyone who lives along the Ohio River when the floods come as they have in the Ohio River at this time.

I am informed the War Department has estimated that approximately \$195,000,000 is needed for flood-control levees, and so forth, throughout the United States at this time. This money is needed now. However, I understand the Budget will reduce the figure perhaps to \$110,000,000. Really, in the Ohio River Valley alone, something like \$100,000,000 is needed this year for necessary levees and flood walls for protection; not for the future but immediately.

The city of Lawrenceburg, Ind., pays yearly in taxes into the Federal Government at least six to eight times the amount required to give that city the needed protection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If instead of cluttering up the Ohio River with low dams they had built high dams on the Ohio and its tributaries, as they have on the Tennessee River, you would now be protected from these disastrous floods. The amendments we put in the flood-control bill last year enable the Federal Government now to go ahead and really control floods on those streams and at the same time improve navigation and utilize the water power.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Chairman, I am not fully conversant with that matter, but, no doubt, the gentleman is right, because he is quite an authority on matters of this kind. No Member of the House has rendered finer service to the House on the power question than has the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. The thing I am particularly interested in at this time is the appropriation of a reasonable amount of funds by the Congress to start these levees and floodwalls. Another thing which should be incorporated in the legislation this year is a renewal of the program of 1937, which would permit the President in cities where they are financially unable to furnish all the lands and rights-of-way to furnish up to one-half of that expense by the Federal Government. Two cities of which Paducah, Ky., is one, have been granted this privilege. It is now unfair to ask other cities which have as little ability and as little funds to supply it 100 percent. This should also be incorporated in the legislation. I propose to do everything I can to bring this legislation to a successful conclusion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### LIGHT AND POWER RATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I agree thoroughly with what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Crowe] has had to say. We have never controlled the floods in this country on any stream so far, except the Tennessee River. Norris Dam, 2 years ago, saved the city of Cairo, Ill.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. And also the Colorado River.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from California says they have controlled floods on the Colorado River. I accept the correction. That is because of Boulder Dam. We are now getting ready to control floods on the Columbia River because of Grand Coulee and Bonneville.

Whenever we can build high dams on the Ohio and its tributaries such as we have built on the Tennessee, the Columbia, and the Colorado, we cannot only improve its navigation perfectly but we can also control its floods and at the same time generate for the people of Ohio and the surrounding country hundreds of thousands of horsepower of electric

energy to be used for the benefit of those people in that area for all time to come. The sooner this is done the better. You will never control floods by building levees or by building low dams.

However, I want to call your attention to the last word in this paragraph I am supposed to speak on. I want to speak to you for a moment on the work of the Federal Power Commission. In my opinion, the Federal Power Commission has done more for the American people in the last 4 years than it had done in all the years of its existence up to 1934 by carrying out the provisions of a resolution which Senator NORRIS and I got passed a few years ago to make and publish a survey of the power rates in every State of this Union and in every municipality or every community of 250 people, giving the county information on power rates.

You might as well get ready, because you are going to have to put up with me the rest of this Congress, at least, and I am going to cross-examine you gentlemen who get up here and attack the T. V. A. or Rural Electrification Administration. I am going to cross-examine you on what power rates your people pay. A man who does not know what electricity costs the people in his home town is not qualified to discuss the power question on this floor. I am going to tell you where you can get that information and how to make your comparisons. Call up the Federal Power Commission and have them send you the power-rates survey for your own State. Then if you want to know how they compare with the T. V. A. rates you send and get one for Mississippi or Tennessee. If you get one for Mississippi, of course, look at Tupelo, Corinth, Amory, or other surrounding towns. If you want to know how they compare with the far West, send down and get one for the State of Washington and compare your rates with what is paid in Tacoma, Wash., or in Seattle. Send and get one for the State of California and see what electricity costs in Los Angeles, the home of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Ford], and you will realize what your people ought to pay for electricity. If we could reduce those rates all over the country to those levels we would save the American people \$1,000,000,000 a year on their light and power bills alone.

That is what I am driving at. The greatest natural resource in all the world outside of the soil from which we live is the water power in our navigable streams and their tributaries. What I am trying to do is to get that water power developed and distributed to your people at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

This is not the Government going into a private business. The power business is a public business. It is necessarily a monopoly, and when private power companies accuse the Government of going into a private business they overlook the fact that they themselves are trying to run a public business and the Federal Government is trying to protect the American people.

Let me say to you, gentlemen, do not any of you from the coal districts deceive yourselves. One of the leading experts that the power companies sent to testify in the T. V. A. investigation said that with \$3 coal they can generate power at 4.18 mills a kilowatt-hour.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. This is cheaper—4.18 mills a kilowatt is cheaper than any municipality in the Tennessee Valley area buys T. V. A. power. You can generate power with coal and distribute it all over this country at the standard T. V. A. rates, without loss, and yet you have the National Coal Association, a bunch of operators who are fighting this program, trying to wring from the coal consumers in this country higher prices for coal. They are interlocked with the utilities to such an extent that people in the coal area are being overcharged—people who live next door to the mines are being overcharged for electric lights and power just as badly as if they lived 300 miles away.



This is a national issue; it is one of the greatest issues the American people have before them today—that of bringing to every home, to every store, and to every business establishment an abundance of electricity at proper rates.

In Europe, outside of Russia and probably some of the Balkan States, from 90 to 100 percent of the farmers have electricity in their homes. In Switzerland it is probably 100 percent. Others are making drives for the same purpose.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman tell us the source of the figures that the farmers in France, at least 90 percent of them, have electricity?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I got the figures from the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. MILLER. Then the gentleman will permit me to say that I saw a good many farms in France just a year ago, and they are just as they were 20 years ago, still burning candles.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, the gentleman has looked over areas in the United States and seen thousands of farms with high-powered lines running right over the houses that cannot even get any service.

In New Zealand, a sparsely settled country, 65 percent of the farmers have electricity.

We can put electricity into every farm home in America without burdening anybody, by developing the water power of this Nation, and squeezing the water out of existing power stocks, and reducing rates to their proper levels.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a question.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman expect to furnish power to everybody in this country by doing the same thing that they are doing down in Tennessee now; namely, buying up all of the public utilities?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he guessed exactly right. I would like to say that it is the policy to spread through this Nation—

Mr. RICH. That is what I thought you were trying to do—Russianize the Government and take over everything.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am trying to Americanize it. I am in favor of carrying this power policy even as far as the city of Williamsport, Pa., the gentleman's home town. I do not want to leave anybody out.

Mr. RICH. Oh, we have electricity in Williamsport now, it is right there now, but we in Williamsport do not want to pay for buying all of the power companies and thus Russianizing the Government. They are Americans up there.

Mr. RANKIN. Then they should be treated as Americans and not as slaves of the Power Trust.

His people buy their electricity from the Pennsylvania Power Co., and as a rule they are overcharged at least 100 percent.

I will give you the comparison of the rates in Williamsport with the T. V. A. rates. Since the residential consumers in Pennsylvania use less than 60 kilowatt-hours a month I will just run the figures up to 100 kilowatt-hours a month.

The first 25 kilowatt-hours a month in Tupelo, Miss., under the T. V. A. rates cost 75 cents; in Williamsport, Pa., the cost would be \$1.90. In Tupelo, Miss., 40 kilowatt-hours cost \$1.20; in Williamsport, Pa., it costs \$2.89. In Tupelo 100 kilowatt-hours a month cost \$2.50; in Williamsport, Pa., it costs \$5.28.

In other words, the domestic consumers in Williamsport are paying tribute to the Power Co. in overcharges of more than 100 percent.

The burden on your commercial consumers, that is your merchants, hotel, restaurant, filling-station operators, and others who pay commercial rates, is even greater. For instance, in Tupelo under the T. V. A. rates 150 kilowatt-hours a month costs the commercial consumer \$4.50; in Williamsport, Pa., it costs \$9.40. In Tupelo 375 kilowatt-hours a month costs the commercial consumer \$10; in Williamsport it costs \$19.80. In Tupelo 750 kilowatt-hours costs the com-

mercial consumer \$17.50; in Williamsport it costs \$37.60. In Tupelo 6,000 kilowatt-hours a month costs the commercial consumer \$90; in Williamsport, Pa., it costs \$211.50.

What I am trying to do is to bring light and power rates down to the T. V. A. levels, not only to the people of Mississippi, but to the people of Pennsylvania, including the ones at Williamsport, and to the people in every other State in this Union, including every farmer in America.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Salaries and expenses: For the Archivist and for all other authorized expenditures of The National Archives in carrying out the provisions of the Act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122-1124; 40 U. S. C. ch. 2A), as amended; the act of July 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 500-503; U. S. C., Supp. II, title 44, ch. 8A), as amended; including personal services in the District of Columbia; supplies and equipment, including scientific, technical, first-aid, protective, and other apparatus and materials for the arrangement, titling, scoring, repair, processing, editing, duplication, reproduction, and authentication of photographic and other records (including motion-picture and other films and sound recordings) in the custody of the Archivist; purchase and exchange of books, including law books, books of reference, maps, and charts; contract stenographic reporting services; purchase of newspapers, periodicals, and press clippings; not to exceed \$100 for payment in advance when authorized by the Archivist for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; travel expenses, including not to exceed \$1,000 for the expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of The National Archives; repairs to equipment; purchase, exchange, maintenance and operation of motor vehicles; and all other necessary expenses, \$850,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for The National Archives when the aggregate cost involved does not exceed the sum of \$50.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOSER: Page 31, line 12, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$850,000" and insert "\$775,000." In line 14, strike out the word "not", and in line 15, after the word "Archives", strike out the remainder of the section.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that we have passed that paragraph of the bill. We have read through line 18.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair we were reading rather rapidly, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOSER] had called the attention of the Chair that he wished to introduce an amendment at this point. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered because The National Archives came into this House last year and had placed in the independent offices appropriation bill a provision which placed them under the civil service. This year they have gone before the committee and have asked for another \$75,000, stating that it is their purpose to employ an additional 33 clerks. If we consider the merit system and adopt the principle of efficiency and recognize the merit system as something promoting efficiency, it is scarcely justifiable that this Congress should proceed and in 1 year give them an additional 33 clerks. In addition to this, there is mention of the fact that they propose to remove about 112,000 cubic feet of records this year, and appropriations are included for that purpose. The amendment will require them to get competitive bids for any necessary removal from garages or other places of storage of records to be placed in The Archives Building proper. I feel that part of the act which specifies a minimum of \$50 should be taken out, and that is the further purpose of this amendment. There is no reason why the Revised Statutes should be set aside to exempt people in The Archives Division from its exactions in respect to removals from garages and other places, to permit items of less than \$50 for transferring, and make them cumulative from time to time whenever they feel they can spend \$50 or a less amount. That is the purpose of the latter part of the amendment. The first part is for the purpose solely of having The National Archives operate on the economical basis we were led to believe they were able to operate when they adopted the merit system and adopted civil service for The Archives. I feel this Committee

should adopt this amendment, believing it is solely in the interest of economy and that it will promote efficiency.

There is much that could be said about The Archives that does not relate to this particular section or to this amendment, particularly with reference to the cost and utility of the Federal Register, which I shall not go into at this time. I trust that the Committee may see fit to adopt this amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Do I understand that the 33 clerks will be taken on without competitive examination?

Mr. MOSER. Nothing is said about that, but under the present rule they would be required to take a competitive examination, if it is adhered to. I suspect they have the 33 clerks already selected and recommended for noncompetitive examination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, The National Archives is not one of the new mushroom agencies that has sprung up under the recent regime. It is an agency for which the minority party can take a portion of the credit or blame, according to whether you consider it a credit or a blame. I think it is a much-needed institution in the Federal Government. If time permitted, which it does not, I might enlarge upon it to show you that prior to the time we had this depository for valuable governmental papers they were stored in cellars and rat holes and every other place in the District of Columbia. The Bureau of the Budget allowed them a very modest increase in personnel to take care of the task of moving these valuable Government documents into The Archives and fixing them for preservation.

The clerks will come in under competitive civil-service examination.

I am unable to follow the logic of the other question involved in the gentleman's amendment. The language of the bill simply permits The National Archives not to have to advertise for bids when the amount involved is not in excess of \$50. I think that would commend itself to the business judgment of any citizen. Where an agency has a moving job, hauling some of these papers from a department to The Archives, or anything of that nature, it would be silly to compel them to go through the formality of calling for competitive bids on such a hauling job.

I very much hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moser] will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moser].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Moser) there were ayes 83 and noes 92.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For three Board members, and for all other authorized and necessary expenditures of the National Labor Relations Board in performing the duties imposed by law or in pursuance of law, including rent and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; repairs and alterations; communications; contract stenographic reporting services; law books; books of reference; newspapers; periodicals; operation, maintenance, and repair of one automobile; \$3,039,600: *Provided*, That the Board may procure supplies and services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$50.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York for the information of the Committee, and the amendment will be pending on the resumption of the session of the Committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Beginning on page 32, in line 18, strike out the remainder of page 32, down to and including line 5 on page 33.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be pending when the Committee resumes its session.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Virginia) having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3743, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1940, had directed him to report it had come to no resolution thereon.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include certain charts and tables from the hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### TAXATION OF COMPENSATION OF PUBLIC OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. DOUGHTON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted a privileged report on the bill (H. R. 3790) relating to the taxation of the compensation of public officers and employees, which was read a first and second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next it may be in order to consider the bill (H. R. 3790) relating to the taxation of the compensation of public officers and employees; that there may be 3 hours of general debate, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], the ranking Republican member on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am so assured.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I will say that I contacted the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] and they said it was entirely agreeable to them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask if it is the purpose of the majority leader then to adjourn from Thursday until Monday, upon the passage of this bill on Thursday?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is correct. It had been the hope that we would reach the so-called May bill on Thursday, but, as the gentleman knows, a great many Members, especially on his side of the aisle, desire to be away Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, and some of them on Monday. So the program now is to dispose of this bill on Thursday and adjourn until Monday, and then take up the May bill for general debate on Monday and try to finish it on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein certain excerpts from the hearings and other relevant matters.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 84

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Mr. Schulte, of Indiana; Mr. Claypool, of Ohio; Mr. John L. McMillan, of South Carolina.

Committee on Roads: Mr. Crowe, of Indiana.

Committee on Insular Affairs: Mr. Beckworth, of Texas.

Committee on Mines and Mining: Mr. Murdock of Arizona.

Committee on Elections No. 3: Mr. John L. McMillan, of South Carolina.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HOOR OF MEETING THURSDAY

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Thursday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the message of the President today in reference to the Works Progress Administration, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a bill which I introduced today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### H. R. 3743

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House, H. R. 3743, making appropriations for the Executive Office and other independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and so forth, carries with it appropriations of a staggering sum. When we are called upon to vote on this bill no choice will be left a Member of the House except to vote "yes" or "no" on the entire measure.

There are a number of items in the bill which have my full approval. The appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, Civil Service Commission, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and many more. There are other appropriations included in the bill which I cannot support. There is an increase of more than a quarter of a million dollars for the National Labor Relations Board and \$16,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority which I cannot support. It is to the latter subject that I desire to address my attention.

One of the questions occupying the minds of the American people today is how long can America continue to authorize \$9,000,000,000 Budgets in the face of \$5,000,000,000 tax receipts? How long can this Government continue to function with annual deficits of nearly \$4,000,000,000? How far beyond a national debt of \$45,000,000,000 can this country go before it reaches the brink of national bankruptcy? How much further can we strain the credit of the Nation before that credit is exhausted? How much further can we plunge this Nation into debt before we face inevitably either inflation or repudiation? Every thoughtful person is asking himself

these questions. And yet in the face of that condition we are confronted with appropriations carried in this bill, including the expenditure of money on new dams and appropriating more money for the construction of the Gilbertsville Dam in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

There is a limit even to the credit of the United States, and that limit may be nearer than many Members of this House realize. There is no attempt being made by the administration to economize, and every effort on the part of the House of Representatives is met by rebuke and criticism of those in high authority in the Government.

The Members of the House also have a mandate from the people in spite of the Public Treasury's use to influence them otherwise. Economy in government is a necessity, that we as the people's Representatives must recognize, in the face of the decree issued by the electorate at the polls on the 8th day of last November. This is one of the big issues before the country today and this Congress cannot discharge its duty to the American people unless it is willing to face the issue courageously. It is my judgment that to continue, the course this Nation is now following will be fatal to America and insolvency will be the final result.

On two former occasions this House refused to grant an appropriation of approximately \$3,000,000 to begin the construction of Gilbertsville Dam. At a time when many Members who were opposed to the project were absent from the House, it was brought in a third time and passed by the slim margin of 7 votes. It is here again, this time asking for approximately \$12,500,000, and two new dams are contained in the bill, namely, Watts bar for \$4,252,000 and Coulter Shoals for \$228,000, and for tributaries \$220,000, or a total of more than \$17,000,000.

I call the attention of the House to the language on page 47 of the bill, lines 14 to 17, inclusive, which read:

And for construction of a dam at or near Watts bar on the Tennessee River, Tenn., and for preliminary investigations of sites for dams at or near Coulter Shoals on the Tennessee River, Tenn., and on tributaries of said river.

But a vote for these items does not mean a vote of \$17,000,000 alone. It means a vote of \$166,000,000, the estimated cost to complete the three projects.

It seems to be the theory that once Congress is embarked upon a costly folly the Federal Government is compelled to complete it. At least in two instances this Congress refused to follow that course in denying further appropriations for the Florida ship canal and Passamaquoddy, and neither is it too late for this Congress to stop the construction of the Gilbertsville Dam. Only about \$5,000,000 of the total has been expended on this project, and less than \$1,000,000 of the total estimated cost of \$64,000,000 has been expended on the preliminary work at Watts bar and Coulter Shoals. These amounts may be saved to the American people by abandoning the present plan to build these costly dams and construct navigation dams instead.

I was somewhat surprised to hear the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] this afternoon declare here on the floor that the Gilbertsville Dam was the key dam for the improvement and navigation of the Tennessee River. I call his attention to the statement—in reference to this same dam—of one of the most distinguished Members of this body, an eminent authority on the subject of navigation in this country, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, who declared on the floor of this House on the 22d of March 1938, page 3876 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, third session of the Seventy-fifth Congress, that, and I quote:

One thought I want to leave in your minds: Whenever you build this Gilbertsville Dam, according to the plans that are now under consideration, you may have a power dam, you may have a flood-control dam, but take it from me, in my horse-sense view, you totally destroy navigation.

This House does not realize that we are building an inland empire in the Tennessee Valley Authority at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation in a vain attempt to produce electric energy for less than it can be produced by private investment companies. The T. V. A. yardstick has been held

up as a glowing example of what Government can do, but when the people once understand and learn the truth of what this Government is doing with their money a solemn protest will be lodged against it.

I am not one of those who believe that suddenly someone has discovered that electric energy can be produced for about one-half or less by the Government than anyone else can produce it. The joint congressional committee appointed to investigate the T. V. A. has forced that agency to divulge some carefully guarded secrets. These concern mainly the method by which that agency allocated costs to the various functions of the system, such as flood control, navigation, and power. It was brought to light by the committee of the multiple use of the dams that 62 percent of the cost is charged off against navigation and flood control, leaving arbitrarily only 38 percent to power. This ridiculous percentage of cost to power at Gilbertsville Dam still shows a per kilowatt cost for installed power of \$277 as against \$64 for Wilson Dam. This House did not know that fact a year ago, and if the Members of this body vote to continue Gilbertsville Dam they are doing so with their eyes wide open to the facts.

It would be interesting, indeed, for the country to know why the comprehensive plans of the Tennessee River prepared by the Army engineers, at a cost of nearly a million dollars has been abandoned and forgotten. That plan called for a complete development of the Tennessee River at a total estimated cost of \$77,000,000.

The present installed program is estimated to cost the people of the Nation anywhere between five hundred million and a billion dollars.

It should always be borne in mind that neither interest nor taxes are ever charged against the T. V. A. yardstick. It was estimated in the appropriation for the fiscal year of 1939 that the total installed capacity of Gilbertsville Dam was 192,000 kilowatts. It now is known from the testimony of Mr. J. S. Krug, chief power-planning engineer of the T. V. A., that the T. V. A. intends to install but 128,000 kilowatts at Gilbertsville, or 64,000 less than the figure previously stated and 32,000 kilowatts less than the 160,000 kilowatts now considered as the ultimate capacity of this project. From studies made it appears that out of a total cost of \$112,000,000 for Gilbertsville Dam about \$35,000,000 will be charged to power, and this amounts to an average of \$275 per kilowatt of stored capacity. This is far above the cost per kilowatt for the estimated cost of all other dams in the T. V. A. This power is not necessary. It will prove a waste of public money, and the appropriation contained in this bill for continuing work on that dam should be defeated.

The appropriation for Watts bar of \$4,252,000 and Coulter Shoals for \$228,000 and the tributaries of \$220,000 should be stricken from the bill entirely in order to save this country from being plunged further into debt by this useless and unnecessary expenditure of money.

The T. V. A. yardstick is not an honest yardstick, and the claims that are being made for it are mostly the result of arbitrary allotments of money, questionable bookkeeping, and an attempt to paint a rainbow of abundant life under planned economy at a terrific cost to the taxpayers of the country.

If the T. V. A. agency operated under the same conditions, the same cost, the same expenses, and the same restrictions as private investment or private utilities, it would not make the claims and representations attributed to it. Instead of a profit, it is operating at a deficit, and the power feature alone, if charged with a very low interest rate of 3½ percent, would show a deficit of more than two and a half million dollars for 1938.

Let us strike out all three appropriations for the dams specified.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana commending Members

of the Congress of the United States for introducing a bill designed to guarantee to farmers the cost of production.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement signed by the two United States Senators from Maryland and the Maryland delegation in the House, together with a brief resolution adopted by the Baltimore City Council.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by the president of the American Federation of Labor at Milwaukee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain figures from the Treasury statement and a brief statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. DIRKSEN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a brief editorial in reference to Mr. Amlie, a former Member of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole a brief editorial and also a quotation from a lawsuit to which I referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain statistical data submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include in connection with my remarks a printed memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon and also a report from my county on the same matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

#### STOP FARM LOSS THROUGH NOXIOUS WEEDS

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the destruction of good land by noxious weeds has moved so rapidly it has assumed the proportions of a national agricultural problem commensurate with that of the Dust Bowl. These weeds infest to some degree thousands of farms and are widely prevalent in practically every State in the Union. Millions of acres are involved, and in some places land values—tax values—of extensive tracts are destroyed. In all probability noxious weeds are the greatest menace from nature that agriculture is facing in this country, because of the serious



economic loss involved. The annual loss to farmers caused by weeds has been estimated as high as \$3,000,000,000, almost one-third of the total farm income. This is 3 times the loss by reason of insect pests of plants, and 12 times the loss suffered through animal diseases. It is only within the last few years that we have recognized the serious implications of the steadily advancing spread of the perennial weeds, particularly in the West and Northwest over the Great Plains area. They are today greatly reducing the total value of farm production. So rapidly do the perennial weeds spread that some of them, for example the bindweed, will double their area in 5 years if not brought under control.

#### WEEDS REDUCE FARM VALUES

The Federal Land Banks, which hold today practically one-half of the farm mortgages of the United States, are insisting that appraisers make careful survey of noxious weed infestation on all lands offered for loans. If the infestation is at all serious, and the acreage involved is large, the loan is refused. Other lending agencies are also insisting that the land be practically free from noxious weeds, before they will consider loans. Land values throughout the entire country have been reduced, because of noxious weeds, on an average of from \$10 to \$20 an acre.

#### WEED-CONTROL LEGISLATION

State legislation has been enacted, and many types of bills are being proposed and introduced in Congress to control or stamp out these costly pests. We have had research as to the extent of the spread and methods of control. We have considered preventive measures in pure seed bills. Proposals have been made for vast expenditures for weed control and eradication without specifying methods of destruction, but providing cooperative procedures and further experimentation. None so far have reached the heart of the problem. Heretofore no clearly defined and specific program for weed control throughout the Nation has been proposed. Mine is inclusive, offering a plan and a method which is applicable to all States facing the problem and willing to cooperate with the Federal Government.

#### CONGRESS ORDERS WEED-CONTROL RESEARCH

Recognizing the seriousness of the weed menace, the Seventy-fourth Congress authorized the Department of Agriculture to carry out "investigations of chemicals for the control of noxious weeds and plants." The report was made in January 1937, and it will, I hope, soon be ordered printed so its important findings may be utilized by the States and by groups working on the problem. The report is concerned largely with sodium chlorate manufacture, distribution, and use. The importance of this herbicide was made so clear and its agricultural value so apparent that the matters of cost and distribution now become questions of immediate importance.

#### NEW PLAN PROPOSED

That report and the building by the Government of the great Bonneville Dam providing, as a byproduct, an abundance of cheap electric power, have led me to the preparation and introduction of a bill—H. R. 196—which appears to me to be of outstanding importance as a measure of farm relief. That bill puts Nation and State back of the farmer in his struggle to overcome the ravages of Nature which he could not successfully battle individually. Weeds cross all lines between national, state, county, and neighborhood boundaries.

The urgency of the problem and the necessity for legislation lead me to ask the attention of this House as I set forth some of the facts about the extent of the weed menace and a proposal for dealing with it expeditiously and without great expenditures from the Federal Treasury. Science has once again come to the aid of the farmer, and the results of Government scientific research may be beneficially applied for farmers if we Members of Congress inform ourselves and agree to proceed intelligently. Listen, then, to the story of the weeds:

#### HOW WEEDS ARE SPREAD

The presence of noxious weeds, and the continued spread of the weed-infested areas, is not solely the fault of the farmer.

The county, state, and federal governments are also to blame and must assume their share of the burden of eradication. Monopoly control of chlorate production has been a contributing factor. It is known that weed seeds are transferred by windstorms, sandstorms, irrigation ditches, farm machinery, motor and railway vehicles, by livestock, especially sheep, by birds, and by interstate traffic in feeds and seeds. Even the airplane often has seeds and weeds as unlisted passengers and has become an agency for spreading weeds swiftly and widely. The individual farmer has no control over these forces and factors. Furthermore, even if he could afford it, the farmer by himself cannot wage a campaign against the spread of noxious weeds. Undertaking such a task would be futile. He cannot command nor control his neighbors nor clear public lands and highways.

Many of the weeds appear to have started in the Northwestern States. Weeds were undoubtedly first introduced by emigrants who brought from other lands seeds of their favorite grains. Most of the farmers knew nothing of the menace, and by the harrow, the plow, and the cultivator they spread the weeds over their lands. A root, picked up at the point of infestation, might be carried 20 or 30 rods and there start a new crop. In the irrigated lands of the West noxious weeds spread with great rapidity, especially along the uncultivated banks of ditches carrying water from the channels into the fields.

Most of the noxious weeds will not be eaten by stock under any conditions, and some of the weeds, if cut with hay, prove poisonous to stock even in the cured form. They are a menace without a redeeming good quality.

#### TENANT FARMING INCREASES WEED MENACE

Much of the rapid growth of weed infestation is traceable to neglect by the tenant farmers, who cannot afford to kill weeds and lack the incentive. A few years ago, when farmers were quite generally cultivating their own fields, they took an interest in the land and saw to it that the values of their farms increased. A good farmer would not permit his land to be ruined by noxious weeds which would destroy crops and render the ground unproductive. With the increase of tenant farmers, who are not encouraged to build up land values but forced to mine the soil and to farm cheaply, weeds spread at a furious rate without hindrance. The tenant makes no attempt to clean up infested areas, nor to prevent spread, as he can more easily move to another farm, leaving ruin behind him.

Rented lands will be kept productive only if costs of eradication are reduced and some premium offered for cooperation in weed control as part of the soil-conservation program. Under my bill it is possible for tenants to become part of the compulsory control program because they are aided by the States which accept benefits offered by the Federal Government. The tenant becomes a working member of a large group upon which cooperation is obligatory.

#### PURE-SEED LAWS

The control and regulation of the traffic in seeds is the best preventive measure against new weed infestation. Such seed legislation does not, however, solve the problem of getting rid of the weeds that are now with us.

Many of the States have passed pure-seed laws. Some are really enforcing them. This Seventy-sixth Congress should enact a stringent seed act, national in scope, regulating the importation of foreign seeds and controlling transportation of seeds and grains across State lines. No doubt this would work hardship upon importers of foreign seeds, but the American farmer must be protected.

Seed-cleaning plants must not be allowed to sell screenings to poultry or sheep feeders if they contain noxious-weed seeds. From many of these mills you can follow the trail of carriers from the vendor of the screenings to the home feed yard by the growth of noxious weeds along the roads.

#### KINDS OF NOXIOUS WEEDS

Annual weeds that grow from seeds alone are quite easily controlled by the ordinary farm methods of cultivation. Perennial weeds which propagate from the roots, as well as from seeds, are the only ones which concern us. Especially

harmful are those which have an extensive underground stem or root system, growing deeply into the soil, far below the reach of any plow. Most of them have joints in their roots and at these joints they send up sprouts to the top of the soil, spreading from this underground growth. Very few of these weeds are natives of North America. Most of them are importations from Asia and Europe, especially from the countries around the Baltic Sea. Among the most serious of the noxious weeds are Canadian thistle, wild morning glory, field bindweed, sometimes called "creeping Jenny," Russian knap weed, quackgrass, white top, Johnson grass, St. Johnswort, perennial sowthistle, Australian fieldcress, and field pepper grass. It is important to note that each type of weed has characteristics which determine control methods.

#### UNIVERSALITY OF WEED MENACE

A national weed-control conference was held in Des Moines, Iowa, in October 1938. Its report gives startling evidence of the universality of the weed problem and the general agreement on several points: (1) That the extent of weed infestation by noxious perennials has passed beyond the small-area stage and that entire farms and sections are completely infested; (2) that the long and costly process of cultural control must be applied to extensive areas; (3) that chemical control through herbicides is now imperative; (4) that Federal aid in supplying chemicals—sodium chlorate—is necessary. Every Congressman representing agricultural sections should study the report.

I quote a few startling sentences for the purpose of bringing home to my colleagues the fact that this matter concerns them and their people. Each statement was made by an authority.

We have in Illinois 100,000 acres of Canada thistle scattered over 79 of the 102 counties. We have had but 1 year in which European bindweed has been considered a noxious weed, and we have well over 100,000 acres.

The loss due to weeds in Indiana has been estimated at approximately \$44,000,000 per year. There is one 90-acre farm in the State that is completely covered with bindweed.

We (in Missouri) made a survey last year and found about 10,000 farms infested. This year's survey showed 16,000 infested farms.

We have somewhere around 37,000,000 acres in farms (in South Dakota), and about one-third of this farm land infested with bindweed. The loss from creeping Jenny is estimated at \$6,000,000 in 1935.

At the present time, according to the available information, Nebraska has about 400,000 acres of bindweed. Every county has some, and most farms have small patches.

Here is the peculiar thing about it, and this is probably true in most of the other States, of our eight primary noxious weeds here in Iowa, there is only one which is a native of the United States, and that happens to be horsenettle. We know that field bindweed exists in approximately 70 counties in this State.

I quote on the situation in California as set forth at another weed conference:

St. Johnswort has crowded out all the forage plants until now they can't get an animal ready for market on 70 acres of land where it took only 7 acres to keep one cow before this infestation came in. You can see what that loss has been to the cattle and sheep industry in California.

The county agricultural agent in one county that I represent in Congress asked me to make an inspection of the spread of the morning glory there. This agent told me that he believed there were 3,000 acres of farming land in that county infested with morning glory. After many miles of travel we concluded that we saw fully 10,000 acres, more or less, infested with noxious weeds, especially morning glory. Some farms had been abandoned—farms that I knew in my boyhood days to be most productive. It was a serious shock to me to see the utter waste and ruin, knowing how valuable the land was at one time, and still would be if the fields of morning glory were eradicated.

#### WEED ERADICATION REQUIRES GOVERNMENTAL ACTION

Weed eradication is a national problem, requiring vigorous and closely integrated action. A successful plan to eradicate weeds must involve participation by the farmers as well as

by the county, state, and federal governments, all of which are concerned to save and restore land values and to compensate for past neglect. This sharing of responsibility in the eradication of weeds is a democratic approach to the problem. It is in accord with the principles of a self-governing people and involves a just division of the burden.

It would be unjust for government, state or national, to attempt to saddle on the farmer the entire expense of weed eradication. In the first place, the cost would approximate \$1,000 per 100-acre farm of 25-percent infestation, and very few farmers have the available cash for such an undertaking. Furthermore, no plan for weed control can be successful unless it involves an integration of scientifically detailed State plans with county directional activities, both relying on the cooperation of the farmer. The farmer must assume the final responsibility for the eradication of weeds from his land, but he should not be left solely to his own resources, for such a scheme would be doomed to failure. He could not have the scientific knowledge, he could not finance buying of chemicals, and he would always be at the mercy of other landowners. He must have the cooperation of his neighbors and the county and state authorities in order to insure against prompt reinfestation if there is neglect. We cannot require him to act without the supplementary help of the Government reaching down to him through state and county authorities and insuring the cooperation of his neighbors.

#### CONTROL OF WEEDS BY AGRICULTURAL TECHNIQUES

It is well known that noxious weeds can be brought under some control and possibly eradicated by agricultural methods, for example, clean cultivation and the planting of competitive crops. Each of these methods has been found to possess merit in certain localities. In general, however, they are too slow or too costly. If noxious weeds are never allowed to grow green leaves above the ground, they cannot get the necessary nourishment to sustain life. If the land can be kept black, free from green leaves, the roots will be killed. However, weeds often lie in the ground for years and at the right time under right conditions they grow. The majority of farmers could not afford to subject their land to clean cultivation which often requires approximately 2 years to bring about complete eradication. The ordinary farmer cannot pay taxes and expenses for cultivation during these years when no crop is grown. When a quarter or a third of the land is clean cultivated, we are still confronted with the normal expansion of weed infestation from the untreated areas. On the Pacific coast we have a method of farming extensively practiced. We plow the ground one year, let it lie fallow that year, and then sow it the following year, reaping a crop of grain every 2 years. This plan makes it difficult to destroy noxious weeds, because the cultivator, nor plow, does not touch the land for a whole year.

#### CHEMICAL HERBICIDES NECESSARY

Chemical herbicides must be employed in conjunction with the aforementioned agricultural technique in order to insure definite headway against the weed menace. It is agreed that chemical treatment is needed to supplement cultural methods and that only chemical treatment is efficacious for certain places. There is no other practical method of killing the noxious weeds in the fence corners, along the ditch lines, highways, railroad rights-of-way, and all other spots where it is impossible to practice clean cultivation. The availability of chlorates at a low cost is necessary for the success of a weed-control program. The high cost of sodium chlorate has prevented weed-control, thus bringing ruin to farms and farmers for the enrichment of a monopoly.

Faced with the necessity of clean cultivation or the costly application of sodium chlorate at present prices for chlorate, the farmer moves off and allows the land to be sold for taxes or to revert to the mortgagee. He becomes a tenant elsewhere or a transient laborer. Society then must bear the burden of another discouraged and impoverished family.

#### SODIUM CHLORATE THE BEST HERBICIDE

A successful plan for the control and eradication of noxious weeds necessitates the use of chemical herbicides, according



to plans and programs carried out for a considerable number of years before the menace is brought entirely under control. Of the known useful chemicals, sodium chlorate has given the best results. Reports of field investigations indicate that this chemical is probably the most effective general herbicide, being useful in practically all climates and on all soils. It is particularly efficacious in combating noxious weeds. Sodium chlorate is recommended as the best all-round herbicide by practically all experienced county agricultural agents who have responsibilities relating to the control and eradication of noxious weeds.

Our Department of Agriculture, realizing the necessity for serious attention to noxious-weed infestation, has made a very careful and thorough study of herbicides and is now in a position to assume responsibilities for the important program I have incorporated in my bill. In carrying out the will of the Seventy-fourth Congress, the Department set up a small experimental chlorate plant which is now in operation at the Arlington Experimental Farm in Virginia, where investigations are being conducted on various phases of chlorate production, the objects being to develop an efficient manufacturing technique and to learn the actual cost of production.

The result of this experimentation has encouraged me to prepare and introduce my bill—H. R. 196—which puts the Government back of the farmer in his fight to keep his lands productive. I propose an enlargement and extension of the Department's work for the benefit of the entire country, providing a manufacturing plant for sodium chlorate which will serve as a price regulator and also for production on a scale which will benefit the farmers of all States undertaking weed-control programs. A great source of cheap electricity at tide-water offers a unique opportunity for this undertaking.

#### SODIUM CHLORATE PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES

Sodium chlorate is made from common salt. Large quantities of electricity are required to transform the brine solution into sodium chlorate, and for this reason chlorates are always made at a source of cheap electric power. I have been amazed at the facts learned during my investigation of the weed problem. A complete monopoly is aided and abetted by Government which allows millions to be accumulated by the privileged few and destroys values of rich farm lands because weed-control herbicides are too costly.

In the United States there is at present only one large commercial producer of sodium chlorate, with a plant located at Niagara Falls, N. Y. It is believed that the annual domestic production is in the neighborhood of ten to twelve million pounds. This quantity is supplemented by importations from Germany, France, and other countries, also largely handled by one firm. The annual importations vary over a very wide range from one to nine million pounds. During the year 1937, 7,000,000 pounds were imported.

The manufacture of sodium chlorate is protected by a specific duty of 1½ cents a pound. It is startling, indeed, to learn that our Government, when faced with a farm-finance problem of staggering proportions, actually levied on farmers a tribute through tariff of \$3,000,000 in 10 years for the benefit of one monopoly, and allowed costs to mount so high weed control has been financially impossible. Is it any wonder that in our Bonneville bill we sought and secured protection from monopoly use of public power?

#### COST OF SODIUM CHLORATE

Chlorate has been sold to the farmers at from 9 to 12 cents per pound, depending on the quantity purchased and the distance from the point of manufacture. The wholesale price of chlorate in Europe is approximately 4 cents a pound, and sometimes this figure is somewhat shaded. It appears that sodium chlorate can be manufactured in this country at prices which will be as low as those prevailing in Europe.

Electricity and salt can be obtained in the United States as cheaply as elsewhere. It is appreciated, however, that our labor costs and our capital charges are greater than in European countries, but only a small force is required to operate an electrochemical chlorate plant. The Government can surely lend its credit for farm necessities at the same low interest rates charged private utilities.

#### SODIUM CHLORATE AT COST

In conjunction with its technical studies, the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils has investigated the economics of sodium chlorate manufacture, distribution, and use. In its report, which the Chief of the Bureau submitted to the House Appropriations Committee in January 1937, it was shown that sodium chlorate could be produced for about 4.9 cents a pound. Subsequent research has indicated that this cost could be reduced, especially at a source of abundant cheap power. Based on these investigations, it is believed that sodium chlorate can be produced at close to 4 cents a pound. If, in accordance with my bill, the chlorate is distributed by the federal government, without profit, to states which participate financially in weed-control programs, it is clear that the net cost to either state or county government or to the farmer would be very small. Furthermore, all that is required of the Government is not a dole or a subsidy but merely legitimate and necessary cooperation in making possible the production and distribution of this herbicide. The money invested by the Government in this enterprise would be paid back to the Federal Treasury. It would be repaid again by the removal of the weed menace and the restoration of lands to the tax rolls. Surely it is not asking too much to have our Government participate in an effort to solve a national problem.

Chlorate must be sold to the farmers at a price that they can afford to pay.

Sodium chlorate can and will make a clean kill if it is spread on in sufficient strength. A bad infestation has required about 6 pounds to the square rod, or 960 pounds to the acre. If sold at present prevailing prices, that would cost the farmer \$100 an acre, often more than the land is worth. Even at the average low infestation with the use of 400 pounds an acre, costs are beyond the farmer's ability to pay. Under such circumstances the mortgagor simply moves off the property and lets the mortgagee take possession. No wonder the Federal Land Banks refuse to lend money to landowners whose property is infested with noxious weeds.

#### PROVISIONS OF H. R. 196

Because chemical weed eradication provides the surest and quickest attack on the weed problem, and because costs are now prohibitive, I have in my bill empowered the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and operate an electrochemical plant for the manufacture of sodium chlorate and to distribute this herbicide at cost to the various States which carry out cooperative programs for the control and eradication of noxious weeds. My bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire land and utilize equipment and facilities now owned by the United States in the vicinity of the Bonneville Dam in Oregon, and to engage in the production of chlorates. For the purpose of acquiring land and constructing a plant capable of producing six to eight million pounds of sodium chlorate annually an appropriation of \$750,000 is to be authorized. To provide an operating fund for the payment of salaries and the purchase of raw materials the sum of \$250,000 is included.

It is believed that chlorate can be produced at such a Government plant at approximately 4 cents a pound. If this is distributed at cost to State governments which participate financially in accordance with other provisions of the bill, it will provide a means of getting sodium chlorate to the farmer at a small fraction of the present market price and at a cost which represents his share of the responsibility. Note that the Government deals only with States and that it rests with them to arrange distribution.

The construction of such a plant this coming summer at Bonneville, on the Columbia River, will do more than any other one thing to stay the advance of noxious weeds, a real menace to agricultural and economic development. The farmer can afford to pay from ten to twenty dollars an acre for herbicides that will wipe out the infestations of noxious weeds. He cannot afford to pay, and will not pay, the present exorbitant monopoly prices for necessary sodium chlorate resulting in a cost of from fifty to one hundred dollars

an acre for treatment. Cheap chlorate is an absolute necessity if we are going to wage a successful war against the great enemy of agriculture in America.

WHY COLLECT ANY DUTY ON CHLORATE WHEN IT ENTERS THE PORTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Government has lent millions of dollars to construct the Bonneville Dam and the electric plant there. No more useful purpose can be found for the sale of 5,000 kilowatts at that plant than for the manufacture of herbicides to help the farmers of America to control a pest which can be controlled if they are freed from the stranglehold of Government-aided monopoly.

#### C. C. C. CAMPS USEFUL IN WEED CONTROL

The Seventy-sixth Congress will probably make the C. C. C. a permanent department of the Government, and will face the need of work programs for W. P. A. It appears to many of us that weed control may offer opportunity for men who find it impossible to secure work in industry. Should these two departments continue and be permanent relief features of our Government, there is nothing workers in W. P. A. or the enrollees in C. C. C. can do of wider benefit than to clean up the noxious-weed infestation that now threatens American agriculture. The Seventy-sixth Congress must so change and modify present legislation that there will be no question about the right to put projects for weed eradication under these agencies. What better public service can be found for a C. C. C. camp than to clean up the St. Johnswort which was described so graphically by the California weed man? A black, fine grazing land more than 11 miles square now totally valueless! C. C. C. camp boys could make a perfect clean-up of this infestation and restore the range to its natural usefulness.

Limitations on C. C. C. activities have been prohibitive so far as weed control on private property is concerned. We must legislate to remove such limitations. We must enroll C. C. C. boys for the farm-defense program. The Federal Government spends huge funds each year to protect our shores against foreign invasion. It maintains armor plants, shipyards, and arsenals to provide defense for our coastal property. To the farmers in the central and western States the invasion of weeds, with the resulting destruction of his property, is a problem so serious that he is convinced the Government should not be indifferent to his welfare, and should assume the responsibility of his defense program.

In order to make any of the plans workable we must produce cheap chlorate free from monopoly control in manufacture and importation.

#### NEED FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

The weed problem must be attacked from every angle, and early and vigorous action is necessary. It is an absolute necessity that American legislative bodies be awakened to the seriousness of the present situation. It is fundamental that we must have cheap sodium chlorate. The farmer must be compelled by law to clean up his fields. If he will not do so, the authorities should at once perform the necessary labor in eradicating the weeds, and the cost of that work should be a first lien on the land, like taxes, to be collected ahead of the mortgage.

There is nothing so seriously threatening the productive acres of America as the encroachment of noxious weeds. The menace must be met without delay.

One of the solutions is to give the farmer a weapon with which he can fight, and that weapon is sodium chlorate. Give him that weapon at the cost of manufacture, which I believe ultimately will be about one-fourth of the present selling price.

When the corn borer threatened, the Government appropriated \$10,000,000 to fight it, and it was in no way as destructive as noxious weeds. Millions have been spent on the boll weevil, a serious threat but not so widely menacing as noxious weeds.

#### SHORTAGE OF CHEMICAL HERBICIDES

As we study the problem of weed control the immensity of it becomes more impressive. Summing it up briefly for your thoughtful consideration, I ask you to recall my statement

that the total amount of sodium chlorate now being manufactured in the United States is about 10,000,000 pounds annually. At a 25-percent infestation the requirement for weed killing is 100 pounds per acre, minimum. It is apparent that the 10,000,000 pounds would be good for only 100,000 lightly infested acres. Every state west of the Mississippi reports several times that many acres infested, with an expansion of 15 percent infested area each year.

There is an actual shortage of sodium chlorate. Only a small percentage of what we need is now being manufactured here. The most we could do with the present output would be to prevent weed expansion from 700,000 acres. We have millions of infested acres. It is true that agricultural technique will care for a large portion of these, but chemical herbicides are now actually needed greatly in excess of the amount manufactured. Shall we provide it with our own men and electric power or bring it from Europe?

Again I remind you that prices have prohibited the use of chemical herbicides, thus causing great farm losses.

We must face two issues. First, reduce prices. Second, a greater supply of chemical herbicides. The Government owns the power. The Government has the technical men who know how to do this piece of work. The way is clear.

#### H. R. 196 MEETS THE SITUATION

My bill does more than to provide for the production and distribution of sodium chlorate, which constitutes the essential and indispensable foundation for work on the weed-control problem. It provides for making this herbicide available at a reasonable price which can be paid by all responsible agencies undertaking distribution to cooperating farmers. It provides for the administration by the Secretary of Agriculture, who is best qualified to judge the needs of the several States and who has at his command the results of years of experiment on this problem. It enables him to marshal the technical forces of the Nation to wage the battle in the most effective manner. Of greatest importance, however, is the fact that it provides, for the first time, a satisfactory basis for a Nation-wide integrated program to free American farmers from the weed menace and to aid the farmer in this expensive and burdensome undertaking.

In placing the building and management of this plant in the Department of Agriculture, I am asking only an extension of work which they have already begun and successfully carried on on a smaller scale in their Arlington experimental plant, where sodium chlorate is manufactured. The Department is the national clearing house for all information on weed control. It is informed on the results of research of all State experimental stations, and it is in close touch with farmers. The formulas under which herbicides are manufactured will undoubtedly be changed from time to time, so it is clearly apparent that the project should be under the control of the Federal agency which can give the best scientific and technical direction from a chemical as well as from a plant standpoint. In order to insure equal benefits to all States, the responsibility must rest with the Federal Government.

From my home county I present a summarized statement which is typical of eastern Oregon:

The total area of the county is 1,284,480 acres; total land in farms is 463,536 acres; cropland is approximately 155,000 acres, and the area infested with noxious weeds probably exceeds 2,500 acres. Infestation is chiefly wild morning glory or bind weed and Canadian thistle.

Approximately 300 acres of whitetop and Russian knap weed and an additional 150 acres of morning glories have been eradicated by chemical treatment and cultivation during the past 6 years. First demonstrations of chemical control began in 1921 by the use of common salt, which was successful but very expensive. Chlorates have been used here since 1928, with the county annually expending from \$1,500 to \$3,500, beginning with 1930.

The first compulsory control of weeds was begun in 1933, when the county court made the entire county a compulsory-control district for whitetop. All of the old acreage is killed, and we think it will eventually be completely eradicated, but new weeds come in from time to time.

Knap weed was placed in the compulsory control district in 1937, and most of this weed has been eradicated.

Chemicals used include sodium arsenite material, common salt, oil, carbon bisulphide, and chlorates, both sodium chlorate and the patent Atlacide. Of this amount approximately 95 percent has



been one of the chlorates, which have proved the most successful from the point of effectiveness and cost. Use of chemical during the past 3 years has been as follows: 1936, 91,499 pounds of chlorate and a small amount of Atlacide; 1937, 56,608 pounds of chlorate and 864 pounds of carbon bisulphide; 1938, 35,235 pounds of chlorate and 3,507 pounds of carbon bisulphide.

You will note that considerably more chlorate was used in 1936 than in the following years. This was due to the fact that cooperation in furnishing chemicals by the W. P. A. enabled the county to supply the material to the farmers at a lower cost. The above amount of chemical, if purchased at present rates, would cost over \$14,000. It is my opinion that a reduction in the cost would result in increased use of this chemical, probably as much as 300 percent.

The control and eradication of weeds is a difficult process, and this material is not perfect. It is, however, the best we know of and cheaper than other materials, even at its present cost. We are making good progress in all areas where infestation is light, but on the larger areas have found it impossible to treat on account of the big cost involved.

H. G. AVERY,  
County Agricultural Agent.

#### House Joint Memorial 14

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent:

Whereas weeds constitute one of the greatest agricultural problems in the United States and constitute the greatest source of agricultural loss, with the possible exception of soil erosion; and

Whereas a conference representing five different upper Mississippi Valley States estimated an annual crop loss of \$1,000,000,000 because of weeds; and

Whereas the State of Idaho, after large expenditures previous to 1936, engaged in \$2,000,000 weed-control program for that State in 1936, three-fourths of which was financed with Federal money; and

Whereas the other Northwestern States, including Utah, Montana, Wyoming, Oregon, and Washington, are taking steps in the matter of weed control; and

Whereas 57 percent of the land in Oregon is in Federal ownership; and

Whereas the weed problem has been recognized by the three farm organizations of Oregon; namely, the Oregon State Grange, the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, and the Farm Bureau Federation, as of major importance, and they have passed resolutions favoring national, State, county, and individual weed control; and

Whereas the Oregon State Planning Board has reported an annual loss of \$1,500,000 from a limited number of perennial noxious weeds in Oregon alone and have recommended additional research work, additional control work, and Federal assistance; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of these bodies that noxious weeds are gaining ground rapidly, that the control measures are inadequate, and that more research is needed and that the weed problem is no longer an individual problem but a public problem: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon hereby does petition the Congress of the United States:

1. To enact legislation declaring that the control of noxious weeds is of major agricultural importance and of such far-reaching consequence that the problem may no longer be considered solely an individual problem but that it has become a major national problem and that in the public interest Federal assistance should be given the States, counties, and individuals cooperating in the control of noxious weeds just as such assistance has been provided for insect, plant, and animal disease control.

2. To provide funds and assistance through special appropriation, W. P. A., or similar channels, civilian conservation camps, soil conservation and agricultural conservation activities for actual work in weed control.

3. To provide for the control of noxious weeds on all federally owned and controlled lands in counties having regularly organized weed-control districts.

4. To require the United States Department of Agriculture to establish, after conference with the interested States, national policies covering (a) weed control, (b) interstate movement of seeds containing weed seeds designated as noxious, and (c) a comprehensive policy of research.

5. To finance a comprehensive Federal and State program of research in the Bureau of Plant Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture to determine upon the best materials and methods that may be used in the control of weeds.

6. To take steps toward the production of cheap weed-killing chemicals at some of the Federal power projects in or near weed-infested regions such as the Bonneville project in Oregon and the Grand Coulee project in Washington; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward one copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to each Member of both Houses of Congress, to the Governors of each of the respective States, and to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. DIES), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. HENDRICKS, indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 25. An act prohibiting the operation of motor vehicles in interstate commerce by unlicensed operators; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 117. An act for the relief of Lulu M. Peiper; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 279. An act for the relief of Pherne Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 529. An act for the relief of Margaret Rose Uncapher, Milton E. Uncapher, Jr., and Andrew G. Uncapher; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 584. An act for the relief of John R. Holt; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 660. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the reapportionment of cotton-acreage allotments not planted by farmers entitled thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 764. An act for the relief of Charles F. Kegel; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 885. An act to authorize and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credit for all outstanding disallowances and suspensions in the accounts of the disbursing officers or agents of the Government for payments made to certain employees appointed by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1076. An act for the relief of the widow of the late William J. Cocke; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to cause a completion of surveys, test borings, and foundation investigations to be made to determine the advisability and cost of putting in a small experimental plant for development of tidal power in the waters in and about Passamaquoddy Bay, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such examinations; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 8, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Public hearings will continue Wednesday, February 8, 1939, at 10 a. m., on social-security legislation in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 8, 1939. Business to be considered: Continuation of hearing on H. R. 2531—transportation bill. Mr. R. V. Fletcher, of the American Association of Railroads, will be the witness.

##### COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, February 8, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of continuing the consideration of H. R. 2880, "To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," carrying out partially the recommendations of the Hepburn report.

##### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in room 446, House Office Building,

Wednesday, February 8, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., for the public consideration of House Joint Resolution 90 and H. R. 2200.

#### COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold a hearing at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 8, 1939, on H. R. 2301, to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926.

#### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 8, 1939, on the bill H. R. 785 and related bills relating to draft convention No. 53.

#### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Thursday, February 9, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., to hold hearings on the reports on Milwaukee Harbor, Wis., Mississippi River at Cochran, Wis., and Tacoma Harbor, Wash.

#### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m. Tuesday, February 21, 1939, on the bill (H. R. 3576) to make effective the provisions of the Officers' Competency Certificates Convention, 1936.

It is contemplated that the hearings on Wednesday, February 8, 1939, on H. R. 785 and related bills will deal with the exemption of vessels of less than 200 gross tons from the provisions of the treaty. The hearing on Tuesday, February 21, on H. R. 3576 will deal particularly with legislation necessary to make effective the provisions of the treaty and problems arising in connection with the provisions of the treaty.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings in Room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m., on the bills and dates listed below:

Tuesday, March 14, 1939:

H. R. 180, H. R. 202, construction of a Nicaraguan Canal; H. R. 201, additional facilities for Panama Canal; H. R. 2667, construction of a Mexican canal.

Tuesday, March 21, 1939:

H. R. 137, H. R. 980, H. R. 1674, relating to annuities for Panama Canal construction force.

Thursday, March 23, 1939:

H. R. 139, H. R. 141, H. R. 142, H. R. 1819, miscellaneous Panama Canal bills.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

398. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended by the acts of July 3, 1926, and February 27, 1931; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

399. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill providing for the seizure and forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, and aircraft used to facilitate violations of the narcotic laws, the counterfeiting laws, and the National Firearms Act (which subjects to regulation by means of the taxing power the traffic in machine guns, sawed-off shotguns, silencers, and other gangster type weapons); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

400. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the draft of a bill to permit any judge or justice of the United States to retire at his option in case he becomes unable, because of permanent disability, to perform the duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

401. A letter from the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, transmitting the report of the Rural Electrification Administration for the year ending June 30, 1938; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

402. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1939 (H. Doc. No. 153); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint resolution 79. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Oil World Exposition at Houston, Tex., to be held April 24 to 29, 1939, inclusive; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3790. A bill relating to the taxation of compensation of public officers and employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3707. A bill relating to information with respect to compensation of corporate officers and employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 78. Resolution requesting information of the State Department on Mexican relations (Rept. No. 24). Laid on the table.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1147) granting an increase of pension to Ernest Killian; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2100) granting a pension to Fannie A. Ott; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3790. A bill relating to the taxation of the compensation of public officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3791. A bill to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939, to the Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3792. A bill authorizing construction of Pine Flat Reservoir and other works in the Kings River Basin, Calif.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 3793. A bill authorizing construction of distribution systems required for irrigation of lands participating in the development of the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 3794. A bill to establish the John Muir-Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., to transfer thereto the lands now included in the General Grant National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.



By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3795. A bill to provide a right-of-way through the Chilkoot Barracks Military Reservation, Alaska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 3796. A bill to extend the period of restrictions on lands of the Quapaw Indians, Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3797. A bill to amend the act, as amended, entitled "An act to refer the claims of the Delaware Indians to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States," approved February 7, 1925; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. R. 3798. A bill to amend section 373 of title 28 of the Code of Laws of the United States, and describing rules for the disqualification of judges in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 3799. A bill to authorize the erection of buildings to accommodate second- and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Texas:

H. R. 3800. A bill to amend section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3801. A bill to extend the time for retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3802. A bill regulating the performance of work by the enlisted or commissioned personnel of the United States Navy, Army, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3803. A bill to provide for a review of the project documents on the Lake Washington Ship Canal, King County, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 3804. A bill to provide more effectively for the national defense, to prescribe the method of supplying the aircraft requirements of the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 3805 (by request). A bill to repeal section 603 of the Revenue Act of 1932; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3806 (by request). A bill to provide for the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 3807. A bill authorizing the Library of Congress to acquire by purchase, or otherwise, the whole, or any part of the papers of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney and Thomas Pinckney, including therewith a group of documents relating to the Constitutional Convention of 1787, now in the possession of Harry Stone, of New York City; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3808. A bill to provide for the use of scientific tests to determine the degree of intoxication of motor-vehicle operators in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 3809. A bill extending the competitive classified civil service of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 3810. A bill to amend section 13 (a) of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938"; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 3811. A bill to provide for the appraisal of the pneumatic mail-tube systems in New York and Boston; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 3812. A bill granting postal employees credit for Saturday in annual- and sick-leave law, thereby conforming to the 40-hour-week or 5-day-week law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

H. R. 3813. A bill to provide for the naval defense, by acquiring stocks of strategic and critical raw materials, minerals, ores, concentrates, and alloys essential to the needs of industry for the manufacture of supplies for the naval forces and the civilian population in time of a national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 3814. A bill for the erection of a memorial to the memory of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox at Thomaston, Maine; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 3815. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office and Federal building at Aberdeen, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 3816. A bill to provide for the filling of vacancies in the Motor Vehicle Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THORKELSON:

H. R. 3817. A bill providing for the cancelation of certain crop-production and harvesting loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3818. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

H. R. 3819. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1930, entitled "An act for the rehabilitation of the Bitter Root irrigation project, Montana," as amended by the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 799); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3820. A bill to amend section 80a of the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 273, U. S. C., Annotated, title 12, sec. 972); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3821. A bill to provide for recognizing the services rendered by civilian officers and employees in the construction and establishment of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 3822. A bill amending the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3823. A bill amending the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 3824. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with Wapato School District No. 54, Yakima County, Wash., for extension of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children of the Yakima Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3825. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near Grosse Pointe, Lake St. Clair, Mich.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3826. A bill to create a United States Public Works Authority, and to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3827. A bill to extend the mining laws of the United States to the Joshua Tree National Monument in California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 3828. A bill granting wartime benefits to veterans of campaigns and expeditions; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3829. A bill to abolish compulsory deductions from salaries of civilian employees for quarters, subsistence, laundry, and similar facilities when not actually used; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H. R. 3830. A bill to amend the Revenue Act of 1934, so as to impose taxes upon the processing of wheat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3831. A bill making miscellaneous amendments to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3832. A bill authorizing parity payments on wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3833. A bill making an appropriation for wheat producers to insure parity payments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. R. 3834. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate steam and other operating engineering in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1887, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 3835. A bill authorizing the Post Office Department to cooperate with the several States in the collection of State taxes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GEYER of California:

H. R. 3836. A bill to provide for the establishment of a home for retired merchant seamen; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CONNERY:

H. R. 3837. A bill to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of Congress approved May 16, 1906; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. R. 3838. A bill to protect trade-mark owners, producers, distributors, and the general public against injurious and uneconomic practices in the distribution of competitive commodities bearing a distinguishing trade-mark, brand, or name through the use of voluntary contracts establishing minimum resale prices and providing for refusal to sell unless such minimum resale prices are observed; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 3839. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in feeds, grains, grain and seed screenings, hay, bedding, packing material, and other materials recognized as carriers of noxious-weed seeds; to prohibit the shipment of certain materials carrying noxious-weed seeds in interstate and foreign commerce; to require certain treatments to kill noxious-weed seeds carried in certain materials in interstate and foreign commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Connecticut:

H. R. 3840. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 3841. A bill to provide for the construction of a highway within the Yellowstone National Park to provide an entrance to such park from the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. R. 3842. A bill to amend section 13 (a) of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938"; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DUNN:

H. R. 3843. A bill to provide \$30,000,000,000 which shall be expended within a period of 5 years to furnish employment and to end poverty in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 3844. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain tract of land to the State of Oregon to be used for public-park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 3845. A bill to amend sections 1001 and 1002 of title 10 of the Social Security Act, approved August 14, 1935; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 3846. A bill to provide payment of pensions and increase in pensions to all veterans in all wars, their widows and dependents, and certain peacetime soldiers; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on certain incomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Comptroller General of the United States to certify for payment certain claims of grain elevators and grain firms to cover insurance and interest on wheat during the years 1919 and 1920 as per a certain contract authorized by the President; to the Committee on War Claims.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolutions Nos. 18, 19, and 20, with reference to Federal aid to State or Territorial veterans' homes, Works Progress Administration, and flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALL:

H. R. 3847. A bill for the relief of Lena Hendel, nee Lena Goldberg; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3848. A bill for the relief of Janet Hendel, nee Judith Shapiro; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOLTON:

H. R. 3849. A bill granting an increase of pension to Caroline Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H. R. 3850. A bill to afford an opportunity of selection and promotion to certain officers of the United States Naval Academy class of 1909; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVINGER:

H. R. 3851. A bill granting a pension to Mettie Grace Cameron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3852. A bill granting a pension to Myrtle R. Oldfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3853. A bill for the relief of Floyd Elton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3854. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Buhner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3855. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3856. A bill granting an increase of pension to Catharine Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3857. A bill granting an increase of pension to Abbie Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3858. A bill granting an increase of pension to Harriet Deamer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3859. A bill granting an increase of pension to Celestia A. Flunks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3860. A bill granting an increase of pension to Phebe L. Alspaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3861. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ellen A. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3862. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah Marks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



H. R. 3863. A bill granting an increase of pension to Margaret I. Reider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3864. A bill granting an increase of pension to Catherine J. Cupp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3865. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Kuder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3866. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3867. A bill granting an increase of pension to Christena Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3868. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eunice Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3869. A bill granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Buckmaster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3870. A bill granting an increase of pension to Samantha Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3871. A bill granting an increase of pension to Esther J. Kimberly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3872. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ora E. Houser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLUETT:

H. R. 3873. A bill granting an increase of pension to Saturna A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 3874. A bill granting a pension to Minnie Seiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3875. A bill for the relief of Hunter George Taft; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3876. A bill for the relief of the estate of Lamar Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNERY:

H. R. 3877. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Fegan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3878. A bill for the relief of John E. Cassidy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3879. A bill for the relief of William A. Ambrose; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EATON of California:

H. R. 3880. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. J. W. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H. R. 3881. A bill for the relief of C. W. Robbins; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3882. A bill for the relief of Beatrice Luce; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3883. A bill for the relief of Jacob Silverberg; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 3884. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment for certain injuries to Mrs. E. J. Clifton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORD of Mississippi:

H. R. 3885. A bill granting a pension to C. E. Kynerd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H. R. 3886. A bill for the relief of Preston Herndon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GARTNER:

H. R. 3887. A bill for the relief of Capt. Walter L. Shearman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 3888. A bill for the relief of Maria Bartolo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3889. A bill for the relief of Richard E. Mooney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3890. A bill for the relief of Dominick Edward Maggio; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HEINKE:

H. R. 3891. A bill granting a pension to Elvira M. Birkner; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3892. A bill granting an increase of pension to Annie Minnie Gist; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 3893. A bill for the relief of Roswell Freeman Corney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KINZER:

H. R. 3894. A bill to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the First Columbia National Bank, of Columbia, Pa.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS of Colorado:

H. R. 3895. A bill granting a pension to Vera Mae Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3896. A bill granting a pension to Ozetta M. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3897. A bill for the relief of Harry L. Smigell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3898. A bill granting a pension to Lewis I. Montgomery; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3899. A bill granting a pension to Mary Catherine Dolphin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3900. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth L. Lloyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3901. A bill granting a pension to Capitola Pease; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3902. A bill granting a pension to Mary J. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 3903. A bill to confer the Medal of Honor, for service in the Philippine Insurrection, on William O. Trafton, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. R. 3904. A bill for the relief of John W. Barbrick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 3905. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eliza Wray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 3906. A bill granting a pension to Charles F. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 3907. A bill for the relief of William A. Reithel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 3908. A bill granting a pension to William E. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3909. A bill for the relief of Silas S. Myers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

H. R. 3910. A bill granting an increase of pension to Phinia E. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. R. 3911. A bill for the relief of Floyd L. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3912. A bill for the relief of the heirs of John Cauley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3913. A bill for the relief of John Angus MacDonald; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3914. A bill granting an increase of pension to John F. Kopczynski; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3915. A bill for the relief of Florence Winifred Shay; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3916. A bill for the relief of Malven A. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3917. A bill for the relief of Frank Charles Robie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3918. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of First Lt. Richard C. Hutchinson, Air Corps Reserve, to the active list of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 3919. A bill for the relief of Alfred P. Paquin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 3920. A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Shaeffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 3921. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 3922. A bill granting a pension to Harriet B. Skene; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3923. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Mecca; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 3924. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles O. Nevel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee:

H. R. 3925. A bill for the relief of Evelyn L. Ratcliffe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THORKELSON:

H. R. 3926. A bill for the relief of the Missoula Brewing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3927. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marijo McMillan Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3928. A bill granting an increase of pension to James J. Scanlon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3929. A bill for the relief of A. J. Samis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 3930. A bill granting a pension to Arta A. Hunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 3931. A bill for the relief of Charles H. LeGay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 3932. A bill for the relief of the estate of Guy M. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN:

H. R. 3933. A bill for the relief of Otho L. Curtner; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

930. By Mr. BURDICK: Memorial of the Twenty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, January 3, 1939, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 44; to the Committee on Appropriations.

931. Also, memorial of the Twenty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, January 3, 1939, House Concurrent Resolution No. 114; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

932. Also, memorial of the Twenty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, January 3, 1939, House Concurrent Resolution No. 135; to the Committee on Agriculture.

933. Also, memorial of the Twenty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, January 3, 1939, House Resolution F; to the Committee on Appropriations.

934. Also, memorial of the Twenty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, January 3, 1939, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 42; to the Committee on Agriculture.

935. Also, memorial of the Twenty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, January 3, 1939, House Concurrent Resolution No. 83; to the Committee on Appropriations.

936. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of Local No. 180, International Molders' Union, of Tacoma, Wash., pointing out that there are now pending in Congress certain amendments to the National Labor Relations Act; asserting that such amendments, though emanating in some cases from known friends of labor, will have the effect of opening up the Labor Act to attack from hostile sources; insisting that the Labor Act has provided immeasurable benefits for

all forms of organized labor and assures it full opportunity to expand and strengthen itself; asserting that with the present spirit in Congress prevailing there is grave danger of the Labor Act being emasculated; and therefore urging Congress to vote down all amendments to the National Labor Relations Act at this time; to the Committee on Labor.

937. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the Yankee Division, Veterans' Association, Boston, Mass., favoring adoption of amendments to legislation governing veterans' affairs; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

938. Also, petition of the Building and Construction Trades Council, of Boston and vicinity, favoring restriction in the amount of appropriations on building and construction projects to a \$25,000 maximum; to the Committee on Appropriations.

939. Also, petition of the Plymouth Co., East Boston, Mass., urging amendment of the social-security law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

940. By Mr. GERLACH: Petition of members of the Lehigh Valley district, Pennsylvania branch, Catholic Verein of America, urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

941. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Mrs. Ida Steiner and 70 other residents of Bluffton, in Nottingham and Harrison Townships, Ind., urging passage of legislation to prevent advertising of alcoholic beverages; stating that the States cannot adequately regulate or prohibit the advertising of liquor as long as Congress permits such advertising through the medium of interstate commerce, and therefore most earnestly urging assistance in securing this proposed legislation in order that State regulations and laws upon the subject may thereby be made more adequate and effective and that radio advertising of alcoholic beverages may be stopped entirely; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

942. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of members of Townsend Club, No. 1, Akron, Fulton County, Ind., expressing their approval of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

943. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition signed by Albert Haskell, Jr., and other residents of Cortland, N. Y., favoring the continuance of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

944. Also, memorial of the California Assembly, Joint Resolution No. 19, relating to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to continue the Works Progress Administration Federal art project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

945. Also, petition of the California Assembly, Joint Resolution No. 20, relating to Federal aid to State or Territorial veterans' homes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

946. By Mr. HAWKS: Resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Waukesha, Wis., urging the passage of legislation to prevent advertising of alcoholic liquors by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

947. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of 390 citizens of the Tenth Congressional District, protesting against provisions of the International Labor Conference Treaty of 1936, Convention No. 53, as ratified by the Senate of the United States in the Seventy-fifth Congress, second session, effective November 1, 1939, under which four licensed men must be carried on all vessels, regardless of size, which pass outside the confines of the inland-waterways system of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

948. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of Allan S. Haywood, president, New York State Industrial Union Council, New York City, favoring the passage of the independent offices appropriation bill with no riders, strings, or conditions attached; to the Committee on Appropriations.

949. Also, petition of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C., concerning the \$3,230,000 appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Appropriations.



950. Also, petition of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, concerning the wage-hour law and the fruit and vegetable industry; to the Committee on Labor.

951. By Mr. LEWIS of Colorado: House Joint Memorial No. 5, of the House of Representatives of the Thirty-second General Assembly of the State of Colorado, concerning the establishment of an airport at or near the city of Cortez, Colo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

952. By Mr. MASSINGALE: Resolution (State of Oklahoma H. Res. No. 17) requesting and memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize sufficient appropriations to carry on the development of the water resources, flood control, drainage, and soil erosion within the State of Oklahoma; commending the Oklahoma delegation in Congress for their activities in behalf of such projects in that State; commending the attitude of the President of the United States in his efforts to bring about such improvements; and commending the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army in solving the water-resource problems of that State; to the Committee on Appropriations.

953. Also, resolution (State of Oklahoma H. Res. 21) memorializing Congress to amend the National Housing Act amendments of 1938, to permit insuring of mortgages involving a principal obligation not to exceed \$3,000 without requiring that the owner and occupant of the property shall have, at the time of issuing the insurance, paid on account of the property 10 percent of the appraised value thereof in cash or its equivalent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

954. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of 51 members of the Holy Name Society, of our Lady of Mount Carmel Church, Bayonne, N. J., petitioning Congress for as long as we shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

955. Also, petition of 294 members of St. Vincent's Parish, Bayonne, N. J., petitioning the Congress for as long as we shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

956. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition (telegram) of the New York State Industrial Union Council, New York City, favoring passage of the independent offices appropriation bill without riders or conditions attached; to the Committee on Appropriations.

957. Also, petition of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C., opposing any reduction in the appropriation of \$3,230,000 for the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Appropriations.

958. Also, petition of 50 residents of the Third Congressional District, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Patman anti-chain-store bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

959. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of 15 residents of Northfield, Vt., favoring revision of the Neutrality Act to read, "The United States shall not furnish war supplies to any aggressor nation"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

960. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Rosa C. Schmidt, grand regent, and 26 members, of Naperville, Ill., Court No. 756, of the Catholic Daughters of America, recommending the adherence to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the acts of August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

961. By Mr. RISK: Petition of Saylesville (R. I.) Post, No. 33, the American Legion, opposing the raising of the Spanish embargo to permit the shipments of arms and ammunition to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

962. Also, petition of Joseph Sansone and 22 other residents of the town of Bristol, R. I., opposing the lifting of the Spanish

embargo and allowing the shipments of arms and ammunition to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

963. By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois: Petition of Rev. Louis F. Ell, pastor, and certain parishioners, of the Blessed Sacrament Church, Belleville, Ill., urging retention on the statute books of the principles enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

964. Also, petition of 1,200 members of the Townsend Club of East St. Louis, Ill. (Frank C. Smith, president), membership of Progressive Miners Union, No. 8, and membership of Bricklayers and Masons Union, No. 30, urging Congress to enact into law House bill 2, known as the Townsend Act, without amendments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

965. By Mr. SECCOMBE: Petition of Mrs. Celia Badalamenti and numerous residents of Canton, Ohio, urging Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended by the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

966. Also, petition of John E. Cighon and other residents of New Philadelphia, Ohio, and vicinity, urging Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended by the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

967. Also, resolution by Canton Council, No. 341, Knights of Columbus, Canton, Ohio, approving the Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, and opposing its repeal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

968. Also, petition of Irene Westerh, chairman, legislative committee, and other members of Court Canton, 1047, Catholic Daughters of America, of Canton, Ohio, urging Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended by the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

969. Also, petition of Albert J. Fox and numerous residents of Canton, Ohio, and vicinity, urging Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended by the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

970. Also, petition of Rev. George Hovanec and others, of Alliance, Ohio, urging adherence by the United States to the principles of the neutrality acts of August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

971. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of Rev. J. E. Bachnak and others, of Winburne, Clearfield County, Pa., urging adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated by the 1935 and 1937 acts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

972. Also, petition of Michael Humenik and others, of Grassflat, Clearfield County, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the 1935 and 1937 acts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

973. By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Petition of certain citizens of Boise, Idaho, urging an enlarged appropriation for the operation of the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

974. Also, petition of certain citizens of Kellogg, Idaho, objecting to any change in the Wagner Labor Act; to the Committee on Labor.

975. Also, petition of the Wallace Trade and Labor Council, Wallace, Idaho, urging the Congress to establish a system of hospitalization and medical care for private citizens; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

976. Also, petition of the Security Benefit Association of Pocatello, Idaho, urging amendment to the social-security bill to exempt subordinate councils or lodges of fraternal benefit associations and their officers from provision of the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

977. By the SPEAKER: Petition of certain citizens of the State of California, petitioning consideration of their petitions with reference to the General Welfare Act (H. R. 2 and S. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

978. Also, petition of Maria Gonzalez and others, of Lares, P. R., petitioning consideration of their petition with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

979. Also, petition of the Associated Puerto Rican Press, Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to propaganda; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose greatness is unsearchable and whose amazing love crowneth all our days, we rejoice that Thou wert the God of our fathers and that Thou art also the God of their succeeding generations. Again we approach that throne of grace from which none has ever been repelled or sent empty away. We come constrained not only by our necessities but encouraged by the blessed assurance that Thy fatherly heart opens with love in response to those who seek Thee. Let Thy hand of blessing rest this day upon all whom Thou hast called to positions of leadership and service in the life of our Nation. May peace and prosperity be the heritage of men everywhere. In the name of Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FORMER RESIDENCE OF THE LATE JUSTICE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States:

FEBRUARY 7, 1939.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE,  
United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: By direction of the Chief Justice I have the honor to transmit to you herewith a copy of the order entered this day selecting three Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States to serve as members of the committee constituted by the joint resolution of Congress of June 22, 1938 (52 Stat. 943, ch. 595), entitled "To authorize the acceptance of title to the dwelling house and property, the former residence of the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, located at 1720 Eye Street NW., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

I am, sir,

Yours very respectfully,

CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY,  
Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States.

ORDER

Pursuant to the joint resolution of Congress of June 22, 1938 (52 Stat. 943, ch. 595), entitled "To authorize the acceptance of title to the dwelling house and property, the former residence of the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, located at 1720 Eye Street NW., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," the Chief Justice announced the selection of the following Associate Justices of the Supreme Court to serve as members of the committee constituted by said joint resolution: Mr. Justice Stone, Mr. Justice Roberts, and Mr. Justice Frankfurter.

Per Mr. CHIEF JUSTICE HUGHES.

FEBRUARY 7, 1939.

### COMMITTEE ON WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 65, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] to fill the vacancy on the Committee on Wildlife Conservation.

COMMEMORATION OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 4, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the joint committee to make suitable arrangements for the commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the First Congress of the United States under the Constitution the following Members of the House: Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas; Mr. SABATH, of Illinois; Mr. BLOOM, of New York; Mr. EATON, of New Jersey; and Miss SUMNER, of Illinois.

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 26, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] to fill the vacancy

on the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the time granted to me to address the House on tomorrow may be postponed for 1 week in view of the legislative program that has been arranged for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a memorial from the Legislature of the State of New Mexico to the Congress with reference to the proposed extension in the State of New Mexico of the boundary of the Navajo Indian Reservation.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman how far it is expected to extend this boundary?

Mr. DEMPSEY. This memorial requests that the Congress not extend it at all. The legislature opposes any extension of the boundary.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean the legislature of the gentleman's State is opposed to extending the boundary of the Navajo Indian Reservation?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. RICH. I wish a lot of other States would do the same as the gentleman's State is doing.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered before the annual convention of the Virginia State Dairymen's Association by Mr. Woodbury Willoughby, economic analyst in the Division of Trade Agreements of the Department of State, on the subject of reciprocal-trade agreements and their effect upon American dairy farmers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution authorizing the President to invite the nations of the world to the council board for a possible solution of the chaotic conditions in the world today.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHANLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of the statement I made yesterday before the Committee on Ways and Means on the subject of proposed amendments to the Social Security Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a short editorial on the splendid service rendered by the United States Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.